arXiv:1611.03177v1 [stat.CO] 10 Nov 2016

A Note on Random Walks with Absorbing barriers and Sequential Monte Carlo Methods

Pierre Del Moral*[1] and Ajay Jasra†[2]

[1]INRIA Bordeaux Sud-Ouest Research Center, FR & School Mathematics and Statistics, University of New South Wales, AUS
[2]Department of Statistics Applied Probability, National University of Singapore, SG

November 11, 2016

Abstract

In this article we consider importance sampling (IS) and sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) methods in the context of 1-dimensional random walks with absorbing barriers. In particular, we develop a very precise variance analysis for several IS and SMC procedures. We take advantage of some explicit spectral formulae available for these models to derive sharp and explicit estimates; this provides stability properties of the associated normalized Feynman-Kac semigroups. Our analysis allows one to compare the variance of SMC and IS techniques for these models. The work in this article, is one of the few to consider an in-depth analysis of an SMC method for a particular model-type as well as variance comparison of SMC algorithms.

Keywords : Random walks with absorbing barriers, quasi-invariant measures, Importance Sampling, Particle samplers, Sequential Monte Carlo, Feynman-Kac semigroups.
Mathematics Subject Classification : Primary 82C80, 60K35; secondary 60F99, 62F15.

1 Introduction

Random walks with absorbing barriers are the simplest example of stochastic processes confined in some domain. In the simplest form, a particle starts at the origin of the straight line and move back and forth as a simple random walk. When the total displacement is larger than some given critical value, the particle gets absorbed. The problem is to determine the statistics of the absorption time, as well as the conditional distributions of the particle before absorption at any time and their limits when the time horizon tends to ∞. These limiting distributions are often called quasi-invariant distributions or Yaglom measures in reference to one of the pioneering work of Yaglom on this subject in the context of branching processes [32].

*p.del-moral@unsw.edu.au
†staja@nus.edu.sg

The origin of these stochastic models certainly started with the Gambler's ruin problem proposed by Pascal to Fermat in 1656, also known as Huygens fifth problem. The seminal book of Feller provides a modern description of these problems and their applications in game theory [22]. Conditional Markov chains of this type are also used in biology and branching processes [23], as well as in molecular physics [29], medicine [2], queuing theory [4], signal processing and rare even analysis [9, 10, 15].

The distribution flow of the random states of these confined Markov chains satisfy a filtering type nonlinear equation in the space of probability measures on the state space. These equations are decomposed into two sets: The first one is a Bayes' type formula. It transforms the distribution of an internal state of the chain by its conditional distribution restricted to the domain of interest. The second one is a simple Markov transport equation. It represents the evolution of the states before a possible absorption. In this interpretation, a quasi-invariant distribution is a fixed point of these nonlinear equations. For a more thorough discussion on these limiting distributions in terms of Feynman-Kac semigroups we refer the reader to [12, 13, 15], and the more recent studies [17, 19].

Another important problem is to compute the conditional distributions of a non absorbed trajectory. These complex measures are defined in terms of Feynman-Kac distributions on path-spaces [11, 15]. They represent the conditional probability of the historical process of the chain given it has not been absorbed. These path space measures are expressed as the distribution of the trajectories of a given Markov chain weighted by some product of non negative potential-type functions. These functions represent the non absorption probabilities at any given state. The numerical integration of Feynman-Kac measures is often performed using Monte Carlo methods.

Several strategies can be developed: The first idea relies on importance sampling techniques. The objective is to find a judicious twisted Markov chain that mimic the evolution of the underlying non absorbed process. One of the main drawback of this technique is that the variance of the importance sampling weights is often degenerate w.r.t. the time parameter; this is discussed below. Another drawback is that is it an intrusive technique, in the sense that it requires to change the physical evolution of the underlying Markov chain. Another strategy is to interpret these importance sampling weights as non absorption probability. When a particle is absorbed, instantly another one duplicates. The selection of the duplicated particle is performed randomly with a probability proportional to its weight. For a more thorough discussion on these particle samplers (sequential Monte Carlo methods) and their application domains we refer the reader to the research monographs [9, 10, 15], the more recent studies [5] and the references therein. The convergence analysis of these particle samplers as the number of particles tends to ∞ has been developed in various directions, including propagation of chaos, fluctuation theorems and large deviation principle. The analysis of the long time behavior of these samplers have been started in [12, 13, 15, 16], including uniform variance and exponential concentration estimates w.r.t. the time horizon.

Nevertheless most of the stochastic analysis developed in these works is expressed in terms of mathematical objects which are difficult to quantify as their rely on the stability properties of normalized non absorption semigroups. As a result it is rather difficult to compare the variance of particle sampler with more conventional Monte Carlo methods based on importance sampling techniques; this is the main topic of this article, for absorbing random walks.

The comparison of variances or efficiency in estimation of different algorithms, for the

same quantity, is an important issue in Monte Carlo approximation. For instance, this is considered in many works such as [7, 24] and in particular for SMC algorithms in [8, 14, 36]. Comparing SMC algorithms is not a trivial task and as shown by the relatively few articles on this subject. For instance [8] compares SMC algorithms which resample multinomially and with the residual method, showing that the asymptotic variance in the CLT of the latter is smaller than the former. [14] also consider variance comparison, but for linear Gaussian models. Perhaps the most complete approach is in [36], where the fixed N, but asymptotic in n, (the time parameter) properties of second moments of normalizing constant quantities are considered. Rather substantial work is required to compare algorithms using the approach of [36], but several interesting and sometimes known facts are derived. In general, however, it is not always trivial to compare SMC algorithms and certainly one important way is by considering specific examples where explicit calculations can be performed.

In this article, as already mentioned, we consider the comparison of limiting variances for the absorbing random walk example, for several different SMC and IS procedures. We note that for comparison between IS and SMC in estimation, generally the latter performs substantially better w.r.t. the time horizon n. For instance, in the estimation of 'marginal' quantities (as we explain later) under reasonably weak conditions [9, 10, 35] the variance of SMC is time-independent and the relative variance of the estimate of the 'normalizing constant' (e.g. the probability that the time to absorbtion is bigger than n) is linear in n [6]. However, often, e.g. for the normalizing constant for IS the same quantity is exponential in n; see [6] and the discussion in [36]. However, this need not be the case for instance if the target and proposal do not become mutually singular in the limit as n grows. This latter property is not always simple to check and can suprisingly occur in some examples e.g. [33]. Therefore, in our absorbing random walk example, an in-depth analysis is of interest, as *a priori* it is not completely obvious that SMC outperforms IS. Our work is also of interest, as it is one of the few articles where one considers analysis of SMC in a very specific example. It is remarked that due to the complexity of the associated calculations, to get very explicit results, one cannot consider a very challenging model. In our example, one does not need IS nor SMC as some very efficient Doob-type transformations can be derived and directly sampled. The point here is to provide an in-depth analysis, which could be of use in more complex models.

The main objective of the article is to improve the understanding of sequential Monte Carlo methods and the stability properties of normalized Feynman-Kac semigroups in the context of 1-dimensional random walks with absorbing barriers. The central idea is to take advantage of some explicit spectral formulae available for these models to derive sharp and explicit estimates. Our analysis allows one to compare the variance of particle samplers with the one of importance sampling type techniques based on random walks with repulsive boundaries.

This article is structured as follows: In section 2 the notation for the article is established. In section 3 we give details of the model under study as well as some properties of them. In section 4 our algorithms as well as our variance results are stated. In section 5, some Feynman-Kac notions are discussed and the proofs of the results in section 3 are stated. Section 6 gives the proofs of our variance results in section 4. The appendix contains some calculations that are used at various places in the article.

2 Notation

In the further development of the article S stand of the finite set $S = \{1, \ldots, d\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, for some d, equipped with the uniform counting measure $x \in S \mapsto u(x) = 1/d$. The boundary of the set S is the set $\partial S = \{0, d+1\}$. We use as a rule the bold letters $\boldsymbol{X_n} := (X_p)_{0 \leq p \leq n} \in S_n := S^{n+1}$ to denote the historical process associated with a given Markov chain X_n on S. We also use the lower index f_n to denote functions on the path spaces S_n. The total variation distance between two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 on S is defined by

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{tv} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in S} |\mu_1(x) - \mu_2(x)|.$$

For any $x \in S$, we let $y \in S \mapsto \delta_x(y) = 1_{x=y}$ the Dirac measure at the state x.

$$\beta(M) := \sup_{(x,y) \in S^2} \|\delta_x M - \delta_y M\|_{tv}.$$

Given for positive function f on S we set $\rho(f) := \sup_{(x,y) \in S^2} [f(x)/f(y)]$.. The Boltzmann-Gibbs transformation Ψ_g from the set of probability measures on S into itself is defined for any probability measure μ on S by the probability measure

$$x \in S \mapsto \Psi_g(\mu)(x) := \frac{1}{\mu(g)} \; g(x) \; \mu(x) \quad \text{with} \quad \mu(g) := \sum_{x \in S} \mu(x) g(x).$$

Given some probability measure μ on S we let $\mathbb{L}_2(\mu)$ be the Hilbert space equipped with the inner product and the norm

$$\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle_\mu = \mu(f_1 f_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 = \mu(f^2).$$

3 Description of the models

3.1 A random walk with absorbing barriers

Let K be the transition probabilities of a symmetric random walk X_n on the 1-dimensional lattice $\mathbb{Z}$ given by

$$K(i, i-1) = K(i, i+1) = \frac{1}{2+\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad K(i,i) = \frac{\theta}{\theta + 2}$$

where θ is a given non-negative parameter. We write K_0 the transition of the simple random walk associated with the null parameter $\theta = 0$. We assume that X_0 has some probability distribution η_0 on S.

Let T_X be the first time the chain X_n exits the set S. We are interested in computing the quantities

$$\eta_n := \text{Law}(X_n \mid T_X > n) \qquad \mathcal{Z}_n := \mathbb{P}(T_X > n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Q}_n := \text{Law}(\boldsymbol{X_n} \mid T_X > n). \tag{1}$$

The stochastic model discussed above can be interpreted as an absorbed random walk X_n^c killed at the barriers ∂S. The killing probabilities are defined by the indicator functions $1 - 1_S$. When the chain hits one of the the barriers ∂S it goes to a cemetery (a.k.a. coffin)

state denoted by the letter c. The killing time of the chain evolving in the augmented state space $S \cup \{c\}$ coincides with T_X.

If $\widehat{\eta}_{n+1} := \eta_n K$ ($\Rightarrow \eta_n = \Psi_{1_S}(\widehat{\eta}_n)$) stands for the conditional distribution of the random state X_{n+1} given $T_X > n$, then we have the geometric formula

$$\mathbb{P}(T_X = n+1) = \left\{ \prod_{1 \leq p \leq n} \widehat{\eta}_p(1_S) \right\} \ (1 - \widehat{\eta}_{n+1}(1_S)) = \widehat{\gamma}_{n+1}(1 - 1_S) \tag{2}$$

with the unnormalized Feynman-Kac measures $\widehat{\gamma}_n$ on S defined by

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{n+1}(f) := \mathbb{E}(f(X_{n+1}) \ 1_{T_X} > n) = \widehat{\eta}_{n+1}(f) \prod_{1 \leq p \leq n} \widehat{\eta}_p(1_S). \tag{3}$$

Observe that $\widehat{\gamma}_n$ satisfies the matrix evolution equation

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{n+1} = \widehat{\gamma}_n \widehat{Q} \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{Q}(x,y) = 1_S(x) \ K(x,y).$$

The confinement model discussed above can be extended to more general processes evolving in absorbing environments, including soft obstacles models associated with partially absorbing media.

The random walk model with absorbing barriers can be solved using spectral decompositions of symmetric tridiagonal matrices. For instance if we consider the symmetric matrix with positive entries

$$\forall x \in S \qquad Q(x,y) := K(x,y) 1_S(y) \quad \text{ then we have } \qquad Q(\varphi_0) = E_0 \ \varphi_0$$

with the top eigenvalue of Q given by

$$E_0 := 1 - \frac{2}{1 + \theta/2} \ \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right) \ \in \ ]0,1[$$

and the corresponding $\mathbb{L}_2(u)$-normalized eigenfunction

$$\varphi_0(x) := \sqrt{\frac{2d}{d+1}} \sin\left(\frac{x\pi}{d+1}\right).$$

A more refined spectral analysis yields the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *For any starting states $(x,y) \in S^2$ and any time horizon n we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(T_X > n \mid X_0 = x) \leq \frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta} \ \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right) \ \mathbb{P}(T_X > n \mid X_0 = y). \tag{4}$$

In addition, we have

$$\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right) \leq E_0^{-n} \ \mathbb{P}(T_X > n \mid X_0 = x) \leq \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right). \tag{5}$$

The proof of the theorem is provided in section 5.3.

The confinement distribution $\mathbb{Q}_n$ and their normalizing constants $\mathcal{Z}_n$ can be expressed in terms of the Doob φ_0-process. This process is defined by the Markov chain Y_n^{φ} on S with initial distribution $\eta_0^{\varphi}(x) := \Psi_{\varphi_0}(\eta_0)(x)$ and elementary Markov transitions

$$M_{\varphi}(x,y) := \frac{Q(x,y)\ \varphi_0(y)}{Q(\varphi_0)(x)}.$$

In this situation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{f_n(X_n)} \mid T_X > n\right) \ \propto\ \mathbb{E}\left(\boldsymbol{f_n(Y_n^{\varphi})}/\varphi_0(Y_n^{\varphi})\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Z}_n = E_0^n\ \eta_0(\varphi_0)\ \mathbb{E}(1/\varphi_0(Y_n^{\varphi})). \tag{6}$$

We also have the limiting quasi-invariant distributions

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta_n(x) = \pi(x) := \Psi_{\varphi_0}(u)(x) = \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)\ \sin\left(\frac{x\ \pi}{d+1}\right)$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(Y_n^{\varphi} = x) = \pi_{\varphi}(x) := \Psi_{\varphi_0}(\pi)(x) = \frac{2}{d+1}\ \sin^2\left(\frac{x\pi}{d+1}\right).$$

All of these formulae can be used to compute explicitly the quantities (1) and the limiting quasi-invariant distributions without to resort to any Monte Carlo approximation. Conversely, we can use these explicit descriptions to improve the understanding of sequential Monte Carlo samplers of conditional Markov chains models. Our first step in this direction is to quantify the stability properties of the nonlinear semigroups of conditional Markov chains.

The stability properties of the flow of probability measures η_n introduced in (1) are expressed in terms of the following quantities

$$\overline{E}_1 \quad = \quad 1 - 4\ \sin\left(\frac{3}{2}\ \frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\ \frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\ \left(\theta + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)^{-1}$$

and the parameters

$$s_k(d) = \sqrt{\frac{d+1}{2}}\ \sin^{-k}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right) \quad \text{with} \quad k \in \{1,2,3\}.$$

We also let η'_n the distributions defined as η_n by replacing η_0 by some possibly different initial distribution η'_0. In this notation, our main result takes basically the following form.

Theorem 3.2. *For any function f s.t. $\pi_{\varphi}(f) = 0$ and any $n \geq 0$ we have*

$$\|M_{\varphi}^n(f)\|_{2,\pi_{\varphi}} \leq \overline{E}_1^n\ \ \|f\|_{2,\pi_{\varphi}} \quad \textit{and} \quad \beta\left(M_{\varphi}^n\right) \leq\ s_1(d)\ \overline{E}_1^n. \tag{7}$$

In addition, we have

$$\|\eta_n - \pi\|_{tv} \leq\ s_2(d)\ \overline{E}_1^n \quad \textit{and} \quad \|\eta_n - \eta'_n\|_{tv} \leq\ s_3(d)\ \frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}\ \overline{E}_1^n\ \ \|\eta_0 - \eta'_0\|_{tv}. \tag{8}$$

The proof of the l.h.s. of (7) relies on spectral decompositions of the Markov transitions of the φ_0-process and it is provided in section 5.2. The r.h.s. of (7) is proved in section 5.1.

The power matrices $(Q^n, \widehat{Q}^n)$ and the conditional distributions $(\eta_n, \widehat{\eta}_n)$ can be interpreted in terms of Feynman-Kac semigroups.

The stability properties of these semigroups have been developed in [9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19], including for continuous time absorption type process on abstract measurable spaces with soft and hard obstacles. Section 5.1 provides a brief review on these semigroups and their Lipschitz regularity properties.

These Feynman-Kac models also allow to interpreted Sequential Monte Carlo samplers and genealogical tree based samplers as mean field particle interpretation of nonlinear semigroups. The variances of these Monte Carlo schemes are also expressed in terms of Feynman-Kac semigroups. For the convenience of the reader a description of these probabilistic models is provided in the appendix on page 27. To get more explicit descriptions of the estimates presented in this article w.r.t. the parameter d the last section of the appendix provide elementary second order expansions of trigonometric functions and their inverse.

3.2 A soft obstacle model with repulsive barriers

Sampling the distributions $\mathbb{Q}_n$ using acceptance conventional rejection techniques amounts of sampling independent copies of the chain X_n, the ones being absorbed are rejected. The relative variance of these rather crude Monte Carlo estimators is inversely proportional to the non absorption time probabilities. For any finite absorbing barriers these relative variance estimates increase exponentially fast w.r.t. the time parameter.

Another natural idea presented in [11] is to turn the hard obstacle into a soft one. These soft obstacle models are based on the following observation

$$\forall x, y \in S \qquad K(x,y)\ 1_S(y) = g(x)\ M(x,y) := Q(x,y) \tag{9}$$

with the function g and the stochastic matrix M on S defined by for any $1 < x < d$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= 1 \\ M(x,x-1) &= K(x,x-1) = M(x,x+1) = K(x,x+1) \quad \text{and} \quad M(x,x) = K(x,x) \end{aligned}$$

with the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} g(1) &= g(d) = \frac{1+\theta}{2+\theta} \\ M(1,1) &= 1 - M(1,2) = \frac{\theta}{1+\theta} = M(d,d) = 1 - M(d,d-1). \end{aligned}$$

We let Y_n be a Markov chain on S, with Markov transitions M and initial distribution η_0. Observe that the chain Y_n is reflected at the boundaries of the set S, and the importance sampling function $g(x)$ represents the chance to stay in the set S starting from the state x.

If $\mathbb{P}_n := \mathrm{Law}(\boldsymbol{Y_n})$ then we have the Feynman-Kac formula

$$d\mathbb{Q}_n = \mathcal{Z}_n^{-1}\ Z_n(Y)\ d\mathbb{P}_n \quad \text{with} \quad Z_n(Y) := \prod_{0 \le p < n} g(Y_p) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Z}_n := \mathbb{E}\left(Z_n(Y)\right). \tag{10}$$

This model can also be interpreted as an absorbed random walk Y_n^c with killing probabilities are defined by the indicator functions $1-g$. The chain Y_n^c evolves in two steps: between

the killing transitions the chain evolves as the chain Y_n. During the killing transition the chain $Y_n^c = y$ at some state $y \in S$ is killed with probability $1 - g(y)$. As before, the chain goes to a cemetery (a.k.a. coffin) state denoted by the letter c. If T_Y stands for the killing time of the chain, we have

$$\eta_n := \mathrm{Law}(Y_n^c \mid T_Y \geq n) \qquad \mathcal{Z}_n := \mathbb{P}(T_Y \geq n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Q}_n := \mathrm{Law}(\boldsymbol{Y_n^c} \mid T_Y \geq n). \tag{11}$$

In this situation, the geometric formula (2) takes the form

$$\mathbb{P}(T_Y = n) = \left\{ \prod_{0 \leq p < n} \eta_p(g) \right\} \; (1 - \eta_n(g)) = \gamma_n(1 - g)$$

with the unnormalized Feynman-Kac measures γ_n on S defined by

$$\gamma_n(f) := \mathbb{E}(f(Y_n) \; Z_n(Y)) = \eta_n(f) \prod_{0 \leq p < n} \eta_p(g) \; \left(\iff \widehat{\gamma}_{n+1} = \gamma_n K \right). \tag{12}$$

Note that γ_n satisfies the matrix evolution equation

$$\gamma_{n+1} = \gamma_n Q \Longrightarrow \eta_{n+1} = \Phi\left(\eta_n\right) := \Psi_g\left(\eta_n\right) M. \tag{13}$$

In addition we have

$$\sup_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \|\Phi^n\left(\mu_1\right) - \Phi^n\left(\mu_2\right)\|_{tv} = \sup_{x_1, x_2} \|\Phi^n\left(\delta_{x_1}\right) - \Phi^n\left(\delta_{x_2}\right)\|_{tv} = \beta(P_n) \tag{14}$$

with the Markov operator P_n defined by

$$P_n(f)(x) = \mathbb{E}\left(f(X_n) \mid T_X > n, \; X_0 = x\right). \tag{15}$$

The collection of operators P_n do not form a semigroup. Nevertheless we have the following stability properties.

Theorem 3.3. *For any time horizon $n \geq 0$ have*

$$\beta(P_n) \leq \; s_2(d) \; \overline{E}_1^{\,n}. \tag{16}$$

In addition we have the contraction inequality

$$\beta(P_{n+\varsigma_P}) \;\; \leq \;\; e^{-1} \; \beta(P_n) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \sum_{n \geq 0} \beta(P_n)^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-2}} \; \varsigma_P \tag{17}$$

with the relaxation time

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_P \;\; &:= \;\; \left[1 + \log\left(\frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta} \; s_3(d)\right)\right] / \log\left(1 + \left(\frac{1 - \overline{E}_1}{\overline{E}_1}\right)\right) \\ &\leq (1 + \theta/2) \; \sin^{-2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \; \frac{\pi}{d+1}\right) \left[1 + \log\left(\frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta} \; s_3(d)\right)\right] \qquad \textit{as soon as} \quad d > 5. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of theorem 3.3 is provided in section 5.3.

4 Sampling Algoritihms

In the further development of this section the quantities $(\mathcal{Z}_n, \gamma_n, \eta_n, \mathbb{Q}_n)$ are approximated by some random quantities $(\mathcal{Z}_n^a, \gamma_n^a, \eta_n^a, \mathbb{Q}_n^a)$ associated with some Monte Carlo samplers. The upper index $(.)^a$ represents the class of Monte Carlo technique and we set

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^a(f) &:= \lim_{N\to\infty} N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\mathcal{Z}_n^a\mathcal{Z}_n^{-1}\ \eta_n^a(f) - \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) \\ w_n^a(f) &:= \lim_{N\to\infty} N\ \mathbb{E}\left([\eta_n^a(f) - \eta_n(f)]^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

When the Monte Carlo estimates are based on independent samples the above quantities are non asymptotic and we can remove the limit operation in the above definitions. The variances

$$w_n^{\mathbf{a}}(f_n) := \lim_{N\to\infty} N\ \mathbb{E}\left([\mathbb{Q}_n^a(f_n) - \mathbb{Q}_n(f_n)]^2\right)$$

are defined as $w_n^a(f)$ by replacing the sample states by their historical version, and the test-observable function f on the states by a function f_n on path-space. We also underline that all the Monte Carlo approximation $(\mathcal{Z}_n^a, \gamma_n^a)$ discussed in the article are unbiased.

4.1 The twisted φ_0-Doob process

This importance sampling scheme is based on sampling N independent copies $(Y_n^{\varphi,i})_{i\geq 1}$ of the Doob φ_0-process Y_n^{φ}. The corresponding Monte Carlo estimates are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_n^{dp} &:= E_0^n\ \eta_0(\varphi_0)\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq i\leq N} \varphi_0^{-1}(Y_n^{\varphi,i}) \\ \gamma_n^{dp} &:= \mathcal{Z}_n^{dp}\times\eta_n^{dp} \quad \text{with} \quad \eta_n^{dp} := \sum_{1\leq i\leq N} \frac{\varphi_0^{-1}(Y_n^{\varphi,i})}{\sum_{1\leq j\leq N}\varphi_0^{-1}(Y_n^{\varphi,j})}\ \delta_{Y_n^{\varphi,i}}. \end{aligned}$$

The variance of these estimates are given by the formulae

$$w_n^{dp}(f) = v_n^{dp}[f-\eta_n(f)] \quad \text{with} \quad v_n^{dp}(f) = \frac{E_0^n}{\eta_0 Q^n(1)}\ \eta_0(\varphi_0)\ \eta_n(f/\varphi_0) - \eta_n(f)^2. \tag{18}$$

The proof of these formula follows elementary variance computations for independent random variables. For the convenience of the reader a sketch of the proof is provided in the appendix, on page 26. At equilibrium these variances become

$$\eta_0 = \pi \Longrightarrow v_n^{dp}(f) = \pi(\varphi_0)\ \pi(f/\varphi_0) - \pi(f)^2.$$

4.2 The twisted reflected process

This importance sampling scheme is based on sampling N independent copies $(Y_n^i)_{i\geq 1}$ of the chain Y_n weighted by the change of probability weights $Z_n(Y)$. The corresponding Monte Carlo estimates are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_n^{IS} &:= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq i\leq N} Z_n(Y^i) \\ \gamma_n^{IS} &:= \mathcal{Z}_n^{IS}\times\eta_n^{IS} \quad \text{with} \quad \eta_n^{IS} = \sum_{1\leq i\leq N} \frac{Z_n(Y^i)}{\sum_{1\leq j\leq N} Z_n(Y^j)}\ \delta_{Y_n^i}. \end{aligned}$$

The variance of these estimates are expressed in terms of the matrices

$$\widetilde{Q}(x,y) = g^2(x)\ M(x,y) \quad \text{and the measures} \quad \widetilde{\eta}_n(f) = \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(f)/\eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1). \tag{19}$$

In this notation, we have the formulae

$$w_n^{IS}(f) \quad = \quad v_n^{IS}(f-\eta_n(f)) \quad \text{with} \quad v_n^{IS}(f) = \frac{\eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1)}{[\eta_0 Q^n(1)]^2}\ \widetilde{\eta}_n(f^2) - \eta_n(f)^2. \tag{20}$$

Here again, the proof of these formula follows elementary variance computations for independent random variables. For the convenience of the reader a sketch of the proof is provided in the appendix, on page 26. By the Frobenius theorem $\widetilde{Q}$ has a positive eigenvalue $\widetilde{E}_0 > 0$ dominating the norm of the other ones. The next theorem shows that $\widetilde{E}_0$ is much larger than the square of E_0. As a consequence the variance of the importance sampler based on twisted reflected random walks increase exponentially w.r.t. the time horizon. Let

$$\sigma(\theta) = \frac{\sqrt{1+\theta}}{\sqrt{1+\theta}+\sqrt{2+\theta}}.$$

Theorem 4.1. *We have the spectral gap inequalities*

$$\widetilde{E}_0 - E_0^2 \leq \frac{1}{(1+\theta/2)^2}\ \left\{\sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\ \left(\theta + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)\ + \frac{1}{2}\ \sigma(\theta)\ \right\}$$

$$\widetilde{E}_0 - E_0^2 \quad \geq \quad \frac{1}{(1+\theta/2)^2}\ \sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\left[\frac{d-1}{d+1}\ \theta + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{1+\frac{2}{d+1}\ \sigma(\theta)\right\}\right]$$

In particular we have

$$c^{-1}\left(1+\ \frac{1}{2+\theta}\ \frac{4}{3}\ \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{d+1}\ \frac{\pi}{2}\right)\right)^n \leq \frac{\eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1)}{[\eta_0 Q^n(1)]^2} \leq c\ (\widetilde{E}_0/E_0^2)^n \tag{21}$$

for some finite constant $c > 0$ whose values do not depend on the time horizon.

The proof of this theorem is provided in the appendix, on page 30. We already mention that the estimate (21) is a consequence of the spectral inequalities stated above (and some elementary estimates on trigonometric functions provided at the end of the proof of the theorem). A proof of this claim is provided in (36).

4.3 Particle sampler with reflection

This particle scheme is based on sampling N copies $\xi_n := (\xi_n^i)_{1\leq N}$ of the absorbed random walk Y_n^c. The transition of the chain $\xi_n \rightsquigarrow \xi_{n+1}$ is decomposed into two steps $\xi_n \rightsquigarrow \xi_n^{killing} \rightsquigarrow \xi_{n+1}$. During the killing transition $\xi_n \rightsquigarrow \xi_n^{killing}$ when a particle is absorbed, instantly one of the N particles duplicates. The choice of the duplicated particle, say ξ_n^j is made independently with a probability proportional to its weight $g(\xi_n^j)$. During the second transition $\xi_n^{killing} \rightsquigarrow \xi_{n+1}$ the particles evolve independently according to the transition M.

The corresponding Monte Carlo estimates are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}_n^{soft} &:= \prod_{0\leq p<n} \eta_p^{soft}(g)\\ \gamma_n^{soft} &:= \mathcal{Z}_n^{soft} \times \eta_n^{soft} \quad \text{with} \quad \eta_n^{soft} := \sum_{1\leq i\leq N} \delta_{\xi_n^i}.\end{aligned}$$

The killing transition can be seen as a birth and death transition. In this interpretation arise the important notion of the ancestral lines of the particles. In this situation, the Monte Carlo approximation $\mathbb{Q}_n^{soft}$ of $\mathbb{Q}_n$ is defined as above by replacing ξ_n^i by its ancestral line.

The variance of these estimates are expressed in terms of the normalized semigroup

$$Q_{p,n} := \frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)} \implies \eta_p Q_{p,n} = \eta_n. \tag{22}$$

In this notation, we have the formulae

$$\begin{aligned}w_n^{soft}(f) &= v_n^{soft}(f-\eta_n(f))\\ v_n^{soft}(f) &= \sum_{0\leq p\leq n} \eta_p\left([Q_{p,n}(f)-\eta_n(f)]^2\right)\\ &\qquad - \sum_{0\leq p<n} \eta_p(g)^2\ \eta_p\left(\left[\ Q_{p,n}(f) - \frac{g}{\eta_p(g)}\ \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

These fluctuation formulae can be deduced from theorems 14.4.3 and 16.6.2 in [10]. For the convenience of the reader, the details of the proof of (23) are provided in the appendix.

The variances $v_n^{soft}(f)$ and $w_n^{\mathbf{soft}}(f_n)$ generally increase linearly w.r.t. the time horizon, while $w_n^{soft}(f)$ are uniformly bounded w.r.t. the time horizon. For instance when $\eta_0 = \pi$ and $f = \varphi_0$ we have

$$\left((1-E_0)+\frac{1}{n}\right)\ \pi\left([\varphi_0-\pi(\varphi_0)]^2\right) \leq n^{-1}\ v_n^{soft}(\varphi_0) \leq \left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)\ \pi\left([\varphi_0-\pi(\varphi_0)]^2\right). \tag{24}$$

The next proposition provides some useful estimates in terms of the parameters (d,θ) and the time horizon.

Proposition 4.1. *For any function f on S we have*

$$\begin{aligned}w_n^{soft}(f) &\leq \eta_n\left([f-\eta_n(f)]^2\right) + \frac{2}{1+\theta}\ \frac{1}{1-e^{-1}}\ \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\ (\varsigma_P-1)\ \mathrm{osc}(f)\\ v_n^{soft}(f) &\leq (n+1)\ \frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}\ \left[\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right]^{-1}\ \|f\|\end{aligned}$$

with the relaxation time ς_P defined in (17). For any functions f_n with at most unit oscillations on the path spaces S_n we have

$$w_n^{\mathbf{soft}}(f_n) \leq 1 + \frac{2n}{1+\theta}\ \frac{1}{1-e^{-1}}\ \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right).$$

Starting at equilibrium $\eta_0 = \pi$, for any function f on S we also have the uniform estimate

$$\sup_{n\geq 0} w_n^{soft}(f) \quad \leq \quad \pi\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) + \; 2\; E_0\; \frac{1+E_0}{1+\overline{E}_1}\; u\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right).$$

The proofs of (24) and proposition 4.1 are provided in section 6.1, on page 20.

4.4 Particle sampler with hard obstacles

This particle scheme is based on sampling N copies $\widehat{\xi}_n := (\widehat{\xi}_n^i)_{1\leq N}$ of the absorbed random walk X_n^c. The transition of the chain is decomposed as above. When a particle is absorbed, instantly one of the remaining particles duplicates. We let $(\widehat{\xi}_n^i)_{1\leq N}$ be the particle system before the killing transition. The corresponding Monte Carlo estimates are given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{Z}_n^{hard} & := & \displaystyle\prod_{1\leq p\leq n} \widehat{\eta}_p^{hard}(1_S) \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{\eta}_n^{hard} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq i\leq N} \delta_{\widehat{\xi}_n^i} \\ \eta_n^{hard} & := & \Psi_{1_S}(\widehat{\eta}_n^{hard}) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_n^{hard} := \mathcal{Z}_n^{hard} \; \times \; \eta_n^{hard}. \end{array}$$

The Monte Carlo approximation $\mathbb{Q}_n^{hard}$ of $\mathbb{Q}_n$ is defined as above by replacing $\widehat{\xi}_n^i$ by their ancestral lines.

We have implicitly assumed that the state space of the particle sampler is the extended space $S \cup \{c\}$ and functions are null on the coffin state c. In this situation, we use the convention $\eta_n^{hard} = \widehat{\eta}_{n+1}^{hard} = \delta_c$ as soon as all particles have exit the set S at some earlier time horizon.

The variance analysis of these particle estimates follows the same line of arguments as the ones of the soft-particle sampler. For a more thorough discussion on these variances we refer the reader to section 6.2.1.

We also emphasize that the variances of these hard particle samplers are generally larger than the ones of the soft obstacles. For instance we have

$$v_n^{hard}(f) \geq v_{n-1}^{soft}(Q(f)) \quad \text{and} \quad w_n^{hard}(f) \geq w_{n-1}^{soft}\left(\frac{Q}{\eta_{n-1}(Q(1))}\,[f-\eta_n(f)]\right). \tag{25}$$

An explicit description of these variances and the proof of these inequalities are provided in section 6.2.2.

At equilibrium, for any function f we have

$$w_n^{hard}(f) \geq E_0\; w_n^{hard}(f) = E_0^{-1}\; v_n^{hard}\,(f-\pi(f)) = w_{n-1}^{soft}(f) = v_{n-1}^{soft}(f-\pi(f)). \tag{26}$$

When $f = \varphi_0$ these variances have a simple expression

$$E_0^{-1}\; v_n^{hard}(\varphi_0) = \left[1+(n-1)\;\left(1-E_0^2\right)\right]\;\pi\left(\left[\varphi_0-\pi(\varphi_0)\right]^2\right) + n\;\left[1-E_0\right]\;\pi(\varphi_0)^2. \tag{27}$$

The detailed proofs of (26) and (27) are provided in section 6.2.3.

The unnormalized measure $\widehat{\gamma}_{n+1}$ discussed in (3) can also be approximated as $N \uparrow \infty$ using the formula

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{n+1}(f) = \gamma_n(K(f)) \;\simeq\; \widehat{\gamma}_{n+1}^{hard}(f) := \mathcal{Z}_n^{hard} \times \widehat{\eta}_{n+1}^{hard}(f).$$

The variance of these particle schemes are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{v}_{n+1}^{hard}(f) &= \lim_{N\to\infty} N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\mathcal{Z}_n^{hard}\mathcal{Z}_n^{-1}\ \widehat{\eta}_{n+1}^{hard}(f)-\widehat{\eta}_{n+1}(f)\right]^2\right) \geq v_n^{soft}(K(f))\\ \widehat{w}_{n+1}^{hard}(f) &= \lim_{N\to\infty} N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\widehat{\eta}_{n+1}^{hard}(f)-\widehat{\eta}_{n+1}(f)\right]^2\right) \geq w_n^{soft}(K(f)).\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The detailed proofs of the formulae and the estimates stated above are provided in section 6.2.

5 A brief review on Feynman-Kac semigroups

5.1 Evolution equations

Let $\Phi^n(\eta_0)=\eta_n$, with $n\geq 0$, be the semigroup of the equation defined in (13). The n-th power Q^n of the matrix Q introduced in (9) can be interpreted as the Feynman-Kac semigroup defined for any function f on S and any $x\in S$ by

$$\begin{aligned}Q^n(f)(x) &:= \mathbb{E}\left(f(Y_n)\ Z_n(Y)\mid Y_0=x\right)\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(f(X_n)\prod_{1\leq p\leq n}1_S(X_p)\mid X_0=x\right) \implies \Phi^n(\eta_0)=\frac{\eta_0 Q^n}{\eta_0 Q^n(1)}.\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

In this notation the Markov operator P_n defined in (15) is given by

$$P_n(f)(x) := \Phi^n(\delta_x)(f)=Q^n(f)(x)/Q^n(1)(x).$$

Also observe that the semigroup Q^n can be interpreted as the conditional distributions

$$Q^n(f)(x)=\mathbb{E}\left(f(X_n)\ 1_{T_X>n}\mid X_0=x\right)=\mathbb{E}\left(f(Y_n^c)\ 1_{T_Y\geq n}\mid Y_0=x\right).$$

By proposition 12.1.7 in [10] for any probability measures (μ_1,μ_2) on S we have the Lipschitz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Phi^n(\mu_1)-\Phi^n(\mu_2)\|_{tv} &\leq \frac{\|Q^n(1)\|}{\max\left(\mu_1Q^n(1),\mu_2Q^n(1)\right)}\ \beta(P_n)\ \|\mu_1-\mu_2\|_{tv}\\ &\leq \rho(Q^n(1))\ \beta(P_n)\ \|\mu_1-\mu_2\|_{tv}.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Recalling that $g=K(1_S)$, we readily check that the conditional distributions $\widehat{\eta}_n$ introduced in (3) satisfy the evolution equation

$$\widehat{\eta}_{n+1}=\widehat{\Phi}(\widehat{\eta}_n):=\Psi_{\widehat{g}}(\widehat{\eta}_n)\widehat{M} \quad \text{with} \quad (\widehat{g},\widehat{M}):=(1_S,K) \tag{31}$$

with the convention $\widehat{\eta}_0:=\eta_{-1}K=\eta_0$ for $n=0$. To check this claim we use the decompositions

$$\widehat{\eta}_{n+1}(f)=\eta_nK(f)=\frac{\eta_{n-1}K(1_S\ K(f))}{\eta_{n-1}K(1_S)}=\frac{\widehat{\eta}_n(1_S\ K(f))}{\widehat{\eta}_n(1_S)}=\Psi_{1_S}(\widehat{\eta}_n)K(f).$$

Observe that (31) is defined as in (13) by replacing (g, M) by $(\widehat{g}, \widehat{M})$. In the reverse angle, we have

$$\Psi_{1_S}(\widehat{\eta}_n) = \Psi_{1_S}(\eta_{n-1}K) = \Psi_g(\eta_{n-1})M = \eta_n.$$

We let $\widehat{\Phi}^n(\widehat{\eta}_0) = \widehat{\eta}_n$, with $n \geq 0$, be the semigroup of the equation defined above. We also have the product formula

$$\mathcal{Z}_n = \prod_{0 \leq p < n} \eta_p(g) = \prod_{1 \leq p \leq n} \widehat{\eta}_p(1_S) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\Phi}^n(\widehat{\eta}_0) = \frac{\widehat{\eta}_0 \widehat{Q}^n}{\widehat{\eta}_0 \widehat{Q}^n(1)}.$$

5.2 Spectral decompositions

The $(d \times d)$-symmetric matrices Q defined in (9) can be rewritten as

$$Q = \frac{1}{2+\theta} \begin{pmatrix} \theta & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & \theta & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \theta & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & \theta & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & \theta \end{pmatrix} = \text{diag}\,(g(1), \dots, g(d)) \;\; M$$

where $\text{diag}\,(g(1), \dots, g(d))$ stands for the diagonal matrix with entries $g(x)$. The matrix M is clearly reversible w.r.t. the probability measure $\mu = \Psi_g(u)$. In addition, we have

$$\pi := \Psi_{\varphi_0}(u) \Longrightarrow \Phi(\pi) = \pi.$$

The eigenvalues of the tridiagonal Toeplitz matrices Q are defined for any $1 \leq i \leq d$ by

$$E_{i-1} \;\; = \;\; \frac{\theta + 2 \;\cos\left(\frac{i}{d+1} \;\pi\right)}{\theta + 2}$$

and the right $\mathbb{L}_2(u)$-normalized eigenvectors

$$\varphi_{i-1}(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2d}{d+1}} \;\; \sin\left[\frac{i}{d+1} \;\; x \;\; \pi\right].$$

In this notation, we have the spectral decompositions

$$Q^n(x,y) \;\; = \;\; \sum_{0 \leq i < d} E_i^n \;\; \varphi_i(x) \;\; \varphi_i(y) \;\; u(y). \tag{32}$$

The Doob φ_0-process, corresponding to the ground state eigenfunction φ_0 defined above, is a Markov chain Y_n^{φ} on S, with initial distribution $\eta_0^{\varphi} = \Psi_{\varphi_0}(\eta_0)$, and the Markov transition

$$\begin{aligned} & M_{\varphi}(x,y) := E_0^{-1} \times \varphi_0^{-1}(x) \;\; Q(x,y) \;\; \varphi_0(y) = \frac{M(x,y)\varphi_0(y)}{M(\varphi_0)(x)} \\ & \Longrightarrow Q^n(x,y) = E_0^n \;\; \varphi_0(x) \;\; M_{\varphi}^n(x,y) \;\; \varphi_0(y)^{-1} \Rightarrow P_n(x,y) = \frac{M_{\varphi}^n(x,y) \;\; \varphi_0(y)^{-1}}{M_{\varphi}^n(\varphi_0^{-1})(x)}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

This yields the estimate

$$\beta(P_n) \leq \rho(\varphi_0)\ \beta(M_\varphi^n). \tag{34}$$

Also observe that M_φ is reversible w.r.t. the probability measure

$$\pi_\varphi := \Psi_{\varphi_0 M(\varphi_0)}(\mu) = \Psi_{\varphi_0^2/g}(\mu) = \Psi_{\varphi_0^2}(u).$$

In addition, we have the $\mathbb{L}_2(\pi_\varphi)$-spectral decomposition

$$M_\varphi^n(x,y) = \pi_\varphi(y) + \sum_{1\leq i<d} \overline{E}_i^n\ \overline{\varphi}_i(x)\ \overline{\varphi}_i(y)\ \pi_\varphi(y).$$

with the orthonormal basis functions $\overline{\varphi}_i := \varphi_i/\varphi_0$ and the eigenvalues $\overline{E}_i := E_i/E_0$. Considering the $\mathbb{L}_2(\pi_\varphi)$ spectral decomposition of the function

$$f = \pi_\varphi(f) + \sum_{1\leq i<d} \pi_\varphi\left(f\ \overline{\varphi}_i\right)\ \overline{\varphi}_i \Rightarrow \pi_\varphi\left(\left[f-\pi_\varphi(f)\right]^2\right) = \sum_{1\leq <d} \pi_\varphi\left(f\ \overline{\varphi}_i\right)^2$$

and

$$\pi_\varphi\left[\left(M_\varphi^n(f)-\pi_\varphi(f)\right)^2\right] \ = \ \sum_{1\leq i<d} \overline{E}_i^{2n}\ \pi_\varphi\left(f\ \overline{\varphi}_i\right)^2 \leq \overline{E}_1^{2n}\ \pi_\varphi\left(\left[f-\pi_\varphi(f)\right]^2\right).$$

This ends the proof of the first assertion in theorem 3.2.

We end this section with a brief discussion on the matrices $\widetilde{Q}$ introduced in (19). Since Q is symmetric, the matrix $\widetilde{Q}$ is $\Psi_{1/g}(u)$-reversible. This implies that

$$\sqrt{\Psi_{1/g}(u)(x)}\ \widetilde{Q}(x,y)\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Psi_{1/g}(u)(y)}} = \sqrt{\Psi_{1/g}(u)(y)}\ \widetilde{Q}(y,x)\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Psi_{1/g}(u)(x)}}$$

or equivalently

$$R(x,y) := \sqrt{g(x)}\ Q(x,y)\ \sqrt{g(y)}\ = \sqrt{g(y)}\ Q(y,x)\ \sqrt{g(x)}.$$

This shows that

$$\sqrt{g(x)}\ Q(x,y)\ \sqrt{g(y)} \ = \ \sum_{0\leq i<d} \widetilde{E}_i(\theta)^n\ \psi_i(x)\ \psi_i(y)\ u(y)$$

for a non increasing sequence of R-eigenvalues $\widetilde{E}_0 > \widetilde{E}_1 \geq \ldots \geq \widetilde{E}_d$ (with $\widetilde{E}_d > -\widetilde{E}_0$ and $\widetilde{E}_0 \in]0,1[$) and some orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}_2(u)$ of right eigenvectors

$$\sqrt{g}\ Q(\sqrt{g}\ \psi_i) = \widetilde{E}_i\ \psi_i.$$

This readily implies the $\mathbb{L}_2(\Psi_{1/g}(u))$-spectral decomposition

$$\widetilde{Q}(x,y) \ = \ \sum_{0\leq i<d} \widetilde{E}_i^n\ \widetilde{\psi}_i(x)\ \widetilde{\psi}_i(y)\ \Psi_{1/g}(u)(y)$$

with the eigenvectors

$$\widetilde{\psi}_i := \sqrt{g\ u(1/g)}\ \psi_i \Rightarrow \Psi_{1/g}(u)\left(\widetilde{\psi}_i\widetilde{\psi}_j\right) = u(\psi_i\psi_j) = 1_{i=j}.$$

5.3 Some quantitative estimates

We have

$$\mu(x) = \frac{g(x)}{d-(1+\theta/2)^{-1}} \geq \inf_{x\in S}\mu(x) = \frac{1}{d}\ \frac{1+\theta}{2(1-1/d)+\theta} \geq \frac{1+\theta}{2+\theta}\ \frac{1}{d} \geq \frac{1}{2d}.$$

It is also readily checked that

$$\pi_\varphi(x) = \frac{2}{d+1}\ \sin^2\frac{x\pi}{d+1} \geq \inf_{x\in S}\pi_\varphi(x) := s_2^{-2}(d) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(g) = \frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}.$$

Proposition 5.1. *We have the following uniform estimates*

$$\sup_{n\geq 0}\rho(Q^n(1)) \ \leq\ \frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}\ \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right) \quad \textit{and} \quad \rho(\varphi_0) = \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \dfrac{1}{\sin\frac{\pi}{d+1}} & \textit{for odd} \quad q \\ \\ \cot\dfrac{\pi}{d+1} & \textit{for even} \quad q \end{array}\right\}.$$

The proof of the proposition is rather technical thus it is housed in the appendix.

The estimate (4) is a direct consequence of the uniform estimate stated in proposition 5.1. By (33) we have the exponential decays of the function $n \mapsto Q^n(1)(x)$ are given by

$$\rho(\varphi_0)^{-1}\ E_0^n \leq Q^n(1) \leq \rho(\varphi_0)\ E_0^n. \tag{35}$$

The proof of (5) is also a direct consequence of (35) and the estimate of $\beta\left(M_\varphi^n\right)$ stated in theorem 3.2.

By proposition 3 in [18] we have

$$\|\delta_x M_\varphi^n - \pi_\varphi\|_{tv} \ \leq\ \frac{1}{2}\ \overline{E}_1^n\ \left(\pi_\varphi(x)\right)^{-1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2}\ \overline{E}_1^n\ \sqrt{\frac{d+1}{2}}\ \frac{1}{\sin\frac{\pi}{d+1}}.$$

Now we are in position to prove theorem 3.2 and theorem 3.3.

Proof of theorem 3.2:

The estimate stated above yields the estimate of the Dobrushin contraction coefficient $\beta\left(M_\varphi^n\right)$ stated in the r.h.s. of (7). The l.h.s. of (8) is now a consequence of (14) and the estimate (34). The proof of the contraction inequality in the r.h.s. of (8) is a simple combination of the l.h.s. of (8) with the contraction inequality (30) and the estimate (34). This ends the proof of theorem 3.2 ■

Proof of theorem 3.3:

The estimate (16) is a consequence of (34) and the estimates of $\rho(\varphi_0)$ and $\beta\left(M_\varphi^n\right)$ stated in proposition 5.1 and in theorem 3.2.

Now we come to the proof of (17). Firstly, we use the decomposition

$$\delta_x P_{m+n} = \Psi_{M_\varphi^m(\varphi_0^{-1})}\left(\delta_x M_\varphi^n\right) P_m = \Psi_{Q^m(1)/\varphi_0}\left(\delta_x M_\varphi^n\right) P_m$$

to check that

$$\delta_x P_{m+n} - \delta_y P_{m+n} = \left[\Psi_{Q^m(1)/\varphi_0}\left(\delta_x M_\varphi^n\right) - \Psi_{Q^m(1)/\varphi_0}\left(\delta_y M_\varphi^n\right)\right] P_m.$$

This implies that

$$\beta(P_{m+n}) \;\leq\; \left[\rho_Q\ \rho(\varphi_0)\ \beta(M_\varphi^n)\right]\ \beta(P_m) \leq \left[\frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}\ s_3(d)\ \overline{E}_1^{\,n}\right]\ \beta(P_m).$$

The end of the proof of the l.h.s. of (17) is now clear. This also implies that

$$\sum_{n\geq 0}\beta(P_n)^2 \;=\; \sum_{k\geq 0}\ \sum_{k\,\varsigma_P\leq n<(k+1)\,\varsigma_P}\beta(P_n)^2 \leq \varsigma_P\ \sum_{k\geq 0} e^{-2k} \leq \frac{1}{1-e^{-2}}\ \varsigma_P.$$

This ends the proof of (17). Also observe that

$$\frac{1}{\log\left(1+\frac{1-\overline{E}_1}{\overline{E}_1}\right)} \;\leq\; \frac{\overline{E}_1}{1-\overline{E}_1}\ \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1-\overline{E}_1}{\overline{E}_1}\right)} \leq \sin^{-2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\ \frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\ (1+\theta/2)$$

as soon as d is chosen so that

$$\frac{1}{2}\ \frac{1-\overline{E}_1}{\overline{E}_1} = \frac{2\ \sin\left(\frac{3}{2}\ \frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\ \frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)}{\theta+2\cos\frac{2\pi}{d+1}} \;<1/2.$$

This condition is met as soon as

$$\frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)^2 < \theta/2+\left(1-2\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)^2\right)\left(\leq \theta/2+\left(1-2\sin^2\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right).$$

This yields the sufficient condition

$$d\geq 2\pi-1>\pi\ \sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}-1\left(\geq \pi\ \sqrt{\frac{7}{2}\ \frac{1}{1+\theta/2}}-1\right).$$

This ends the proof of theorem 3.3. ∎

We end this section with the spectral analysis of the matrices

$$R=\frac{1}{2+\theta}\begin{pmatrix} \theta\ \epsilon_\theta & \sqrt{\epsilon_\theta} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0\\ \sqrt{\epsilon_\theta} & \theta & 1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0\\ 0 & 1 & \theta & 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0\\ \vdots & & & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 0\\ \vdots & & & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 & \theta & \sqrt{\epsilon_\theta}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon_\theta} & \theta\ \epsilon_\theta \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{1}{2}\leq \epsilon_\theta=\frac{1+\theta}{2+\theta}\leq 1.$$

By the Perron-Frobenius theorem we have $\rho(\psi_0)\vee\rho(\widetilde{\psi}_0)<\infty$. In addition, arguing as in the proof of (33) and (35) we have

$$\rho(\widetilde{\psi}_0)^{-1}\ \widetilde{E}_0^n \leq \widetilde{Q}^n(1)\leq \rho(\widetilde{\psi}_0)\ \widetilde{E}_0^n. \tag{36}$$

The spectral inequalities stated in theorem 4.1 readily implies that

$$(\rho(\widetilde{\psi}_0)\rho(\varphi_0)^2)^{-1}\ (\widetilde{E}_0/E_0^2)^n \leq \frac{\eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1)}{[\eta_0 Q^n(1)]^2} \leq \rho(\widetilde{\psi}_0)\rho(\varphi_0)^2\ (\widetilde{E}_0/E_0^2)^n.$$

This ends the proof of (21).

5.4 Some combinatorial properties

Let Q_0 be the matrix associated with the null parameter $\theta = 0$. The computation of the entries of the power matrices Q_0^n resumes to the computation of the number of paths of the simple random walk confined in the set S. More precisely, we have

$$Q_0^n(x_0, x_n) = 2^{-n}\ C_n(x_0, x_n)$$

where $C_n(x_0, x_n)$ stands for the number of paths of length n in S of the simple random walk starting at x_0 and ending at x_n; that is, we have that

$$C_n(x_0, x_n) := \mathrm{Card}\left\{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \in S^{n-1}\ :\ \forall 1 \leq k \leq n\ \ |x_k - x_{k-1}| = 1\ \right\}.$$

The powers of the matrices Q and Q_0 are related by the formula

$$Q^n(x, y) \ = \ \frac{1}{(1+\theta/2)^n} \sum_{0 \leq m \leq n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ m \end{array} \right)\ (\theta/2)^m\ Q_0^m(x, y). \tag{37}$$

We let $C_n(x)$ be the number of non absorbed paths starting from x; that is

$$C_n(x) := \sum_{y \in S} C_n(x, y).$$

By (32) we have the formulae

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0^n(x, y) &= 2^{-n}\ C_n(x, y) \\ &= \frac{2}{d+1} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \cos^n\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\ \pi\right)\ \sin\left[\frac{i}{d+1}\ x\ \pi\right]\ \sin\left[\frac{i}{d+1}\ y\ \pi\right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0^n(1)(x) &= 2^{-n}\ C_n(x) \\ &= \frac{2}{d+1} \sum_{1 \leq i\ \mathrm{odd}\ \leq d} \cos^n\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\ \pi\right)\ \sin\left[\frac{i}{d+1}\ x\ \pi\right]\ \cot\left[\frac{i}{d+1}\ \pi\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the sine multiple-angle formula

$$\sin(x\alpha) = \sin(\alpha) \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \lfloor (x-1)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^l\ \left(\begin{array}{c} x-(l+1) \\ l \end{array} \right)\ 2^{x-2l-1}\ \cos^{x-2l-1}(\theta)$$

which is valid for any $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we find that

$$C_n(x) \ = \ \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \lfloor (x-1)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^l\ \left(\begin{array}{c} (x-1)-l \\ l \end{array} \right)\ C_{n+(x-1)-2l}(1).$$

This gives a simple proof of the recurrence formula presented in [21, 27] using sophisticated combinatorial and spectral techniques.

6 Variance analysis

This section provides a detailed discussion on the variance of the Sequential Monte Carlo samplers presented in section 4. We shall not discuss the variance of the importance sampling technique based on reflected processes discussed in section 4.2. The degeneracy of these Monte Carlo schemes w.r.t. the time horizon has been already dicussed in theorem 4.1.

Most of the section is dedicated with the proofs of the variance estimates of the hard and soft particle samplers stated in section 4. These variances are expressed in terms of the Feynman-Kac linear and non linear semigroups (Q^n, η_n) and $(\widehat{Q}^n, \widehat{\eta}_n)$ discussed in section 3 and section 5.1. Explicit formulae can be derived when the system start at equilibrium, that is when $\eta_0 = \pi$. We shall also discuss the situation where the test function f is given by the eigenfunction φ_0.

In connection to this, we already notice that

$$\pi = \Psi_{\varphi_0}(u) \Rightarrow \pi(\varphi_0) = 1/u(\varphi_0) = \pi(1/\varphi_0) = \sqrt{\frac{d(d+1)}{2}}\ \tan\left(\frac{1}{d+1}\ \frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

This elementary observation can be used to derive explicit variance formulae for the importance sampling schemes based on the twisted φ_0-Doob process discussed in section 4.1. For instance using (18) it is readily check that

$$v_n^{dp}(\varphi_0) = \pi(\varphi_0)\ (1 - \pi(\varphi_0)) = \frac{1}{u(\varphi_0)}\left(\frac{1}{u(\varphi_0)} - 1\right)$$

and

$$w_n^{dp}(\varphi_0) = \pi(\varphi_0)^2\ \ (\pi(\varphi_0)\pi(1/\varphi_0) - 1) = \frac{1}{u(\varphi_0)^2}\left(\frac{1}{u(\varphi_0)^2} - 1\right).$$

At equilibrium the normalized Feynman-Kac semigroups (22) become

$$\eta_0 = \pi \Longrightarrow Q_{p,p+n}(x,y) = \frac{Q^n(x,y)}{\eta_0(Q^n(1))} = E_0^{-n} Q^n(x,y) = E_0^{-n} Q^n(1)(x)\ P_n(x,y).$$

In addition, by (4) we have the uniform estimate

$$E_0^{-n} Q^n(1)(x) = \frac{Q^n(1)(x)}{\pi(Q^n(1))} \leq \rho(Q^n(1)) \leq \frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}\ \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right).$$

6.1 The soft obstacle model

This section is dedicated to the analysis of the variances of the particle sampler with reflection presented in section 4.3. By (23) we have the variance formula

$$\begin{aligned} w_n^{soft}(f) &= v_n^{soft}(f - \eta_n(f)) \\ &= \eta_n\left([f - \eta_n(f)]^2\right) + \sum_{0 \leq p < n} (1 - \eta_p(g)^2)\ \eta_p\left([Q_{p,n}(f - \eta_n(f))]^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

At equilibrium $\eta_0 = \pi$ these formulae become

$$\begin{aligned} w_n^{soft}(f) &= \pi\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) + (1-E_0^2)\sum_{1\le p\le n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p}{E_0^p}(f-\pi(f))\right]^2\right) \\ v_n^{soft}(f) &= \sum_{0\le p\le n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}-\pi(f)\right]^2\right) - E_0^2\sum_{1\le p\le n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}-\frac{g}{E_0}\,\pi(f)\right]^2\right) \\ &= \sum_{0\le p\le n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}-\pi(f)\right]^2\right) - \sum_{1\le p\le n}\pi\left(\left[Q\left\{\frac{Q^{p-1}(f)}{E_0^{p-1}}-\pi(f)\right\}\right]^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$v_n^{soft}(f) \le \sum_{0\le p\le n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}-\pi(f)\right]^2\right).$$

Also observe that

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^{soft}(f) &\ge \sum_{0\le p\le n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}-\pi(f)\right]^2\right) - E_0\sum_{0\le p<n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}-\pi(f)\right]^2\right) \\ &= \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^n(f)}{E_0^n}-\pi(f)\right]^2\right) + (1-E_0)\sum_{0\le p<n}\pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}-\pi(f)\right]^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

This assertion follows from the fact that

$$\pi\left([Q(f)]^2\right) = \pi\left([K(1_S f)]^2\right) \le \pi Q\left(f^2\right) = \pi(g)\;\pi\left(f^2\right) = E_0\;\pi\left(f^2\right).$$

For instance when $\eta_0 = \pi$ and $f = \varphi_0$ we have (24). Now we come to the proof of the variance estimated stated in proposition 4.1.

Proof of proposition 4.1:
Starting at equilibrium we also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{E_0^{n-p}}(f-\pi(f))\right]^2\right) &= \pi\left(\varphi_0^2\;\left(M_\varphi^{n-p}\left([f-\pi(f)]/\varphi_0\right)\right)^2\right) \\ &= \pi(\varphi_0)\;\pi_\varphi\left(\varphi_0\;\left(M_\varphi^{n-p}\left([f-\pi(f)]/\varphi_0\right)\right)^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that

$$\pi_\varphi\left([f-\pi(f)]/\varphi_0\right) = \frac{1}{\pi(\varphi_0)}\;\pi\left([f-\pi(f)]\right) = 0$$

and $\|\varphi_0\| \le \sqrt{2}$, for any $\mathrm{osc}(f) \le 1$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{E_0^{n-p}}(f-\pi(f))\right]^2\right) &\le 2\;\overline{E}_1^{\,2(n-p)}\;\pi_\varphi\left([f-\pi(f)]^2/\varphi_0^2\right) \\ &= 2\;\overline{E}_1^{\,2(n-p)}\;\frac{1}{u(\varphi_0^2)}u\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) \quad \left(\le 2\;\overline{E}_1^{\,2(n-p)}\right) \\ &= 2\;\overline{E}_1^{\,2(n-p)}\;\left[u\left([f-u(f)]^2\right) + (\pi(f)-u(f))^2\right]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} w_n^{soft}(f) &\leq \pi\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) + 2\,\frac{1+E_0}{1+\overline{E}_1}\,\frac{1-E_0}{1-\overline{E}_1}\,u\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) \\ &\leq \pi\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) + 2E_0\,\frac{1+E_0}{1+\overline{E}_1}\,u\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) \\ &\leq \pi\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right) + 4\,u\left([f-\pi(f)]^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

The last assertion follows from

$$\frac{1-E_0}{1-\overline{E}_1} = E_0\,\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{3}{2}\,\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)} \leq E_0.$$

More generally, observe that

$$\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right](x)$$

$$= \frac{Q^{n-p}(1)(x)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}\,\sum_{x'\in S}\,\eta_p(x')\,\frac{Q^{n-p}(1)(x')}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}\left[P_{n-p}(f)(x)-P_{n-p}(f)(x')\right].$$

For any function f with at most unit oscillations we find that

$$\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2(x) \leq \frac{Q^{n-p}(1)(x)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}\,\rho(Q^{n-p}(1))\,\beta(P_{n-p})^2.$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right\| &\leq \rho(Q^{n-p}(1))\,\beta(P_{n-p})^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}\,\sin^{-1}\frac{\pi}{d+1}\,\beta(P_{n-p})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (17) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} w_n^{soft}(f) &\leq 1+\frac{2}{1+\theta}\,\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\sum_{0\leq p<n}\,\beta(P_{n-p})^2 \\ &\leq 1+\frac{2}{1+\theta}\,\frac{1}{1-e^{-1}}\,\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)(\varsigma_P-1). \end{aligned}$$

For path space models we also have

$$w_n^{\mathbf{soft}}(f_n) \leq 1+\frac{2n}{1+\theta}\,\frac{1}{1-e^{-1}}\,\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)$$

$$v_n^{soft}(f) \leq (n+1)\,\frac{2+\theta}{1+\theta}\,\left[\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right]^{-1}\,\|f\|.$$

This ends the proof of the proposition. ■

6.2 The hard obstacle model

This section is dedicated to the analysis of the variances of the particle sampler with hard obstacles presented in section 4.4. Observe that the particle sampler $\widehat{\xi}_n$ is defined as ξ_n by replacing (g, M) by $(1_S, K)$. This simple observation shows that the variance formulae in the hard obstacle case can be deduced from the ones of the soft obstacle sampler by replacing the Feynman-Kac semigroups associated to (g, M) by the ones defined in terms of $(1_S, K)$. These variances are discussed in section 6.2.1. We also show that these variances are larger than the ones associated with the soft obstacle sampler.

6.2.1 Variances before killing

As in (22) and (23) the variance of these estimates are expressed in terms of the normalized semigroup

$$\widehat{Q}_{p,n} := \frac{\widehat{Q}^{n-p}}{\widehat{\eta}_p \widehat{Q}^{n-p}(1)} \implies \widehat{\eta}_p \widehat{Q}_{p,n} = \widehat{\eta}_n. \tag{39}$$

For $n = p + 1$ we have

$$\widehat{Q}_{p,p+1}(f) = \frac{\widehat{Q}(f)}{\widehat{\eta}_p(1_S)} = \frac{1_S}{\widehat{\eta}_p(1_S)} \; K(f).$$

Replacing in (23) and (38) the quantities (η_n, Q^n) by $(\widehat{\eta}_n, \widehat{Q}^n)$ we have

$$\widehat{v}_n^{hard}(f) = \sum_{0 \leq p \leq n} \widehat{\eta}_p \left(\left[\widehat{Q}_{p,n}(f) - \widehat{\eta}_n(f) \right]^2 \right) - \sum_{0 \leq p < n} \widehat{\eta}_p \left(1_S \; \left[K \widehat{Q}_{p+1,n}(f) - \widehat{\eta}_n(f) \right]^2 \right)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{w}_n^{hard}(f) &= \widehat{v}_n^{hard}(f - \widehat{\eta}_n(f)) \\ &= \widehat{\eta}_n \left([f - \widehat{\eta}_n(f)]^2 \right) + \sum_{1 \leq p < n} (1 - \widehat{\eta}_p(1_S)^2) \; \widehat{\eta}_p \left(\left[\widehat{Q}_{p,n}(f - \widehat{\eta}_n(f)) \right]^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We are now in position to prove the inequalities (28).

Proof of formulae (28):

We have the commutation property

$$\widehat{Q}^n(f) = 1_S \; Q^{n-1}(K(f)) \Longleftrightarrow 1_S \; K \; \widehat{Q}^n(f) = \widehat{Q}^{n+1}(f) = 1_S \; Q^n(K(f)).$$

This implies that

$$1_S K \widehat{Q}_{1,n}(f) = 1_S \; \frac{K \widehat{Q}^{n-1}(f)}{\eta_0 K \widehat{Q}^{n-1}(1)} = \frac{\widehat{Q}^n(f)}{\eta_0 \widehat{Q}^n(1)} = \widehat{Q}_{0,n}(f).$$

Recalling that $\widehat{\eta}_0 = \eta_0$ has a support on S we conclude that

$$\widehat{\eta}_0 \left(\left[\widehat{Q}_{0,n}(f) - \widehat{\eta}_n(f) \right]^2 \right) = \widehat{\eta}_0 \left(1_S \; \left[K \widehat{Q}_{1,n}(f) - \widehat{\eta}_n(f) \right]^2 \right).$$

When $1 \leq p < n$ we also have

$$\widehat{Q}_{p,n}(f) = \frac{\widehat{Q}^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_{p-1}K\widehat{Q}^{n-p}(1)} = 1_S \ \frac{Q^{n-p-1}(K(f))}{\eta_{p-1}Q^{n-p}(1)}$$

and

$$1_S K\widehat{Q}_{p+1,n}(f) = \frac{\widehat{Q}^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_p K\widehat{Q}^{n-p-1}(1)} = 1_S \ \frac{Q^{n-p-1}(K(f))}{\eta_p Q^{n-p-1}(1)} = 1_S \ Q_{p,n-1}(K(f)).$$

Recalling that the measures η_p have a support on S we prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{v}_n^{hard}(f) \\
&= \eta_{n-1}K\left([f - \eta_{n-1}(K(f))]^2\right) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{0\leq p<(n-1)} \eta_p K\left(\left[1_S \ \frac{Q^{(n-1)-(p+1)}(K(f))}{\eta_p Q^{(n-1)-p}(1)} - \eta_{n-1}(K(f))\right]^2\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad - \sum_{1\leq p<n} \eta_{p-1}Q\left([Q_{p,n-1}(K(f)) - \eta_{n-1}(K(f))]^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that for any measure μ and any function f on S we have

$$\mu([Q(f)]^2) = \mu([K(1_S f)]^2) \leq \mu(K(1_S f^2)) = \mu Q(f^2).$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}_n^{hard}(f) &\geq \sum_{0\leq p\leq(n-1)} \eta_p\left([Q_{p,n-1}(K(f)) - \eta_{n-1}(K(f))]^2\right) \\
&\qquad - \sum_{1\leq p<n} \eta_{p-1}\left([\ Q\left\{Q_{p,n-1}(K(f)) - \eta_{n-1}(K(f))\right\}]^2\right) = v_{n-1}^{soft}(K(f)).
\end{aligned}$$

This also shows that

$$\widehat{w}_n^{hard}(f) = \widehat{v}_n^{hard}(f - \widehat{\eta}_n(f)) \geq v_{n-1}^{soft}\left([K(f) - \eta_{n-1}(K(f))]\right) = w_{n-1}^{soft}(K(f)).$$

This ends the proof of the estimates (28). ∎

6.2.2 Variances at killing times

After the killing transition the particle measures are given by

$$\gamma_n^{hard}(f) := \mathcal{Z}_{n-1}^{hard} \ \times \ \widehat{\eta}_n^{hard}(1_S f) = \widehat{\gamma}_n^{hard}(f1_S) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_n^{hard}(f) = \Psi_{1_S}\left(\widehat{\eta}_n^{hard}\right).$$

Therefore the variances of these empirical measures can be expressed in terms of the ones of the particle sampler before killing. More precisely, we have the formulae

$$v_n^{hard}(f) = \widehat{v}_n^{hard}(f1_S) \quad \text{and} \quad w_n^{hard}(f) = \widehat{w}_n^{hard}\left(\frac{1_S}{\widehat{\eta}_n(1_S)}\left[f - \Psi_{1_S}\left(\widehat{\eta}_n\right)(f)\right]\right).$$

Observe that

$$w_n^{hard}(f) = v_n^{hard}\left(\frac{1}{\eta_{n-1}(g)}\left[f - \eta_n(f)\right]\right).$$

The formulae (25) are now a direct consequence of (28).

We also have

$$v_n^{hard}(f) = \sum_{0\leq p<n} \eta_p K\left(\left[1_S\ \frac{Q^{(n-1)-p}(f)}{\eta_p Q^{(n-1)-p}(1)} - \eta_{n-1}(Q(f))\right]^2\right)$$

$$- \sum_{1\leq p<n} \eta_{p-1}(g)\ \eta_p\left(\left[Q_{p,n-1}(Q(f)) - \eta_{n-1}(Q(f))\right]^2\right)$$

and

$$w_n^{hard}(f)$$

$$= \widehat{w}_n^{hard}\left(\frac{1_S}{\widehat{\eta}_n(1_S)}\left[f - \Psi_{1_S}\left(\widehat{\eta}_n\right)(f)\right]\right)$$

$$= \widehat{\eta}_n\left(1_S\ \left[\frac{1}{\eta_{n-1}(g)}\left[f - \eta_n(f)\right]\right]^2\right) + \sum_{1\leq p<n}\ (1-\eta_{p-1}(g)^2)\ \widehat{\eta}_p\left(\left[\widehat{Q}_{p,n}\left\{\frac{1_S}{\widehat{\eta}_n(1_S)}\left[f-\eta_n(f)\right]\right\}\right]^2\right).$$

Recalling that

$$\widehat{Q}_{p,n}\left[\frac{1_S\ f}{\widehat{\eta}_n(1_S)}\right] = \frac{1}{\eta_{n-1}(g)}\ \frac{1_S\ Q^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_{p-1}Q^{n-p}(1)}$$

we conclude that

$$\eta_{n-1}(g)\ w_n^{hard}(f)$$

$$= \eta_n\left(\left[f-\eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) + \frac{1}{\eta_{n-1}(g)}\ \sum_{1\leq p<n}\ (1-\eta_{p-1}(g)^2)\ \widehat{\eta}_p\left(1_S\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}(f-\eta_n(f))}{\eta_{p-1}Q^{n-p}(1)}\right]^2\right)$$

$$= \eta_n\left(\left[f-\eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) + \sum_{1\leq p<n}\ (1-\eta_{p-1}(g)^2)\ \frac{\eta_{p-1}(g)}{\eta_{n-1}(g)}\eta_p\left(\left[Q_{p,n}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right).$$

6.2.3 Variances at equilibrium

Starting at equilibrium $\eta_0 = \pi$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_0\ w_n^{hard}(f) &= E_0^{-1}\ v_n^{hard}\left(f-\pi(f)\right) \\ &= \pi\left(\left[f-\pi(f)\right]^2\right) + \left(1-E_0^2\right)\ \sum_{1\leq p<n}\ \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p}{E_0^p}(f-\pi(f))\right]^2\right) \\ &= w_{n-1}^{soft}(f) = v_{n-1}^{soft}(f-\pi(f)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E_0^{-2} v_{n+1}^{hard}(f) = \sum_{0\le p\le n} \pi K\left(\left[\frac{1_S}{E_0}\ \frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p} - \pi(f)\right]^2\right) - E_0 \sum_{1\le p\le n} \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p} - \pi(f)\right]^2\right).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi K\left(\left[\frac{1_S}{E_0}\ \frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p} - \pi(f)\right]^2\right) &= \frac{1}{E_0}\ \pi K\left(\frac{1_S}{E_0}\ \left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}\right]^2\right) - \pi(f)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{E_0}\ \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p}\right]^2\right) - \pi(f)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{E_0}\ \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p} - \pi(f)\right]^2\right) + \left[\frac{1}{E_0} - 1\right]\ \pi(f)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_0^{-1}\ v_{n+1}^{hard}(f) = &\ \pi\left(\left[f - \pi(f)\right]^2\right) + (n+1)\left[1 - E_0\right]\ \pi(f)^2 \\
&+ \left(1 - E_0^2\right) \sum_{1\le p\le n} \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p} - \pi(f)\right]^2\right) \\
= E_0^2\ \pi\left(\left[f - \pi(f)\right]^2\right) &+ (n+1)\left[1 - E_0\right]\ \pi(f)^2 \\
&+ \left(1 - E_0^2\right)\ \left[v_n^{soft}(f) + \sum_{1\le p\le n} \pi\left(\left[\ Q\left\{\frac{Q^{p-1}(f)}{E_0^{p-1}} - \pi(f)\right\}\right]^2\right)\right] \\
\le E_0^2\ \pi\left(\left[f - \pi(f)\right]^2\right) &+ (n+1)\left[1 - E_0\right]\ \pi(f)^2 \\
&+ \left(1 - E_0^2\right)\ \left[v_n^{soft}(f) + E_0 \sum_{0\le p<n} \pi\left(\left[\frac{Q^p(f)}{E_0^p} - \pi(f)\right]^2\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $f = \varphi_0$ we find that (27).

Acknowledgements

We thank Persi Diaconis for discussions that led to the writing of this article. AJ was supported by a Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 2 grant: R-155-000-161-112.

Appendix

Proof of the variance formulas (18) and (20)

We have

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^{dp}(f) &= \mathbb{E}(\varphi_0^{-1}(Y_n^h))^{-2}\ N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq i\leq N}\varphi_0^{-1}(Y_n^{\varphi,i})\ f(Y_n^{\varphi,i}) - \mathbb{E}(\varphi_0^{-1}(Y_n^{\varphi})\ f(Y_n^{\varphi}))\right]^2\right) \\ &= \eta_0(\varphi_0)\ \frac{E_0^n}{\eta_0 Q^n(1)}\ \eta_n(f/\varphi_0) - \eta_n(f)^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the same vein we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_n^{dp}(f) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{\varphi_0^{-1}(Y_n^{\varphi})}{\mathbb{E}\left(h^{-1}(Y_n^{\varphi})\right)}(f(Y_n^{\varphi}) - \eta_n(f))\right]^2\right) \\ &= \frac{E_0^n}{\eta_0 Q^n(1)}\ \eta_0(\varphi_0)\ \eta_n\left(\varphi_0^{-1}\left[f-\eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) \leq \rho_Q\ \rho(\varphi_0)\ \eta_n\left(\left[f-\eta_n(f)\right]^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of (18).

Now we come to the proof of (20). We have

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^{IS}(f) &:= N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{\mathcal{Z}_n^{IS}}{\mathcal{Z}_n}\ \eta_n^{IS}(f) - \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) \\ &= \mathcal{Z}_n^{-2}\ N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq i\leq N}\left(Z_n(Y^i)\ f(Y_n^i) - \mathbb{E}(Z_n(Y)\ f(Y_n))\right)\right]^2\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\left(\frac{Z_n(Y)}{\mathcal{Z}_n}\right)^2\ f(Y_n)^2\right) - \eta_n(f)^2 = \frac{\eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1)}{[\eta_0 Q^n(1)]^2}\ \widetilde{\eta}_n(f^2) - \eta_n(f)^2. \end{aligned}$$

In much the same way, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_n^{IS}(f) := N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\eta_n^{IS}(f) - \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{Z_n(Y)}{\mathcal{Z}_n}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right) \\ &= \mathcal{Z}_n^{-2}\ \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n\left(\left[f-\eta_n(f)\right]^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n\left[\left[f-\eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) &= \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(f^2) - 2\eta_n(f)\ \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(f) + \eta_n(f)^2\ \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1) \\ &= \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1)\left[\widetilde{\eta}_n(f^2) - 2\eta_n(f)\widetilde{\eta}_n(f) + \eta_n(f)^2\right] \\ &= \eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1)\ \left\{\widetilde{\eta}_n\left(\left[f-\widetilde{\eta}_n(f)\right]^2\right) + \left(\widetilde{\eta}_n(f) - \eta_n(f)\right)^2\right\} \end{aligned}$$

we obtain the formula

$$w_n^{IS}(f) = \frac{\eta_0\widetilde{Q}^n(1)}{[\eta_0 Q^n(1)]^2}\ \left\{\widetilde{\eta}_n\left(\left[f-\widetilde{\eta}_n(f)\right]^2\right) + \left(\widetilde{\eta}_n(f) - \eta_n(f)\right)^2\right\}.$$

This ends the proof of (20). ∎

Mean field particle samplers

Notice that

$$\eta_{n+1} = \eta_n \mathcal{K}_{\eta_n} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{K}_{\eta_n}(x,z) := (\mathcal{S}_{\eta_n} M)(x,z) := \sum_{y \in S} \mathcal{S}_{\eta_n}(x,y)\ M(y,z) \tag{40}$$

and the Markov transition

$$\mathcal{S}_{\eta_n}(x,y) = g(x)\ \delta_x(y) + (1 - g(x))\ \Psi(\eta_n)(y).$$

The mean field particle interpretation of the the measure valued equation (40) is a Markov chain $\xi_n = (\xi_n^i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ on the product space S^N, starting with N independent random variables $\xi_0 := (\xi_0^i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ with common law η_0. The transition of the chain are given for any $x = (x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N} \in S^N$ by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\xi_{n+1} = x \mid \xi_n\right) = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq N} \mathcal{K}_{m(\xi_n)}(\xi_n^i, x_i) \quad \text{with} \quad m(\xi_n) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \delta_{\xi_n^i}.$$

This particle model (a.k.a. sequential Monte Carlo) is a genetic type particle model with a acceptance-rejection selection transition and an exploration transition dictated by the potential function g and the Markov transition M.

For path-space models we also have

$$\mathbb{Q}_{n+1} = \Phi_{n+1}(\mathbb{Q}_n) := \Psi_{g_n}(\mathbb{Q}_n) M_{n+1} \tag{41}$$

where M_{n+1} stands for the Markov transition of the historical process $\mathbf{X}_n$ and g_n is the extension of g to path-spaces defined by

$$\forall (x_0, \ldots, x_n) \in S_n \qquad g_n(x_0, \ldots, x_n) := g(x_n).$$

The mean field particle approximation associated with the updating-prediction equation (41) is defined as above with N path-space valued particles

$$\zeta_n^i = \left(\zeta_{0,n}^i, \zeta_{1,n}^i, \ldots, \zeta_{n,n}^i\right).$$

This mean field particle sampler coincide with the evolution of the genealogical tree of the genetic type particles defined above. In this interpretation, the path-space particles can be interpreted as the ancestral lines of the individual at every time step.

By (31) we also have

$$\widehat{\eta}_{n+1} = \widehat{\eta}_n \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_{\widehat{\eta}_n} \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_{\widehat{\eta}_n} := \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\widehat{\eta}_n} K \tag{42}$$

and the Markov transition

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\widehat{\eta}_n}(x,y) = 1_S(x)\ \delta_x(y) + (1 - 1_S(x))\ \Psi(\widehat{\eta}_n)(y).$$

The mean field particle interpretation of the the measure valued equation (42) is a Markov chain $\widehat{\xi}_n = (\widehat{\xi}_n^i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ on the product space S^N, starting with N independent random variables $\widehat{\xi}_0 = \xi_0$. This particle model is also a genetic type particle model with a acceptance-rejection selection transition and an exploration transition dictated by the potential function 1_A and the Markov transition K.

Local fluctuation variance formula

Following the fluctuation analysis developed in chapter 9 in [9], and in chapters 14 and 16 in [10], the limiting variances of the soft particle samplers presented in section 6.1 are expressed in terms of a sequence of independent centered Gaussian fields U_{n+1} with covariance functions defined by teh formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(U_{n+1}(f)^2) &= \lim_{N\to\infty} N\ \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\eta_{n+1}^{soft}(f) - \Phi\left(\eta_n^{soft}\right)(f)\right]^2\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in S} \eta_n(x)\ \mathcal{K}_{\eta_n}(x,y)\ \mathcal{K}_{\eta_n}(x,z)\ \ (f(y)-f(z))^2 \\
&= \eta_{n+1}(f^2) - \eta_n\left(Q(f)^2\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad -\eta_{n+1}(f)\ \left[\eta_n((1-g)^2)\ \eta_{n+1}(f) + 2\eta_n\left((1-g)Q(f)\right)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

with the matrix $Q(x,y) = g(x)M(x,y)$. We check the last assertion using the decompositions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(U_{n+1}(f)^2) &= \eta_n\left(g^2\left[M(f^2) - M(f)^2\right]\right) + \eta_n((1-g)^2)\ \left[\eta_{n+1}(f^2) - \eta_{n+1}(f)^2\right] \\
&\quad +\eta_n\left((1-g)Q(f^2)\right) + \eta_n\left(g(1-g)\right)\eta_{n+1}(f^2) - 2\eta_n\left((1-g)Q(f)\right)\eta_{n+1}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

For centered functions, the above formulas become

$$\mathbb{E}([U_{n+1}(f-\eta_{n+1}(f))]^2) = \eta_{n+1}(f^2) - \eta_n\left(Q(f)^2\right).$$

Proof of the variance formulae (23)

By theorems 16.2.1 and 16.6.2 in [10] we have

$$v_n^{soft}(f) = \eta_0\left(\left[\frac{Q^n(f)}{\eta_0 Q^n(f)} - \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) + \sum_{1\le p\le n} \mathbb{E}\left(\left(\ U_p\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)} - \eta_n(f)\right]\ \right)^2\right).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&v_n^{soft}(f) \\
&= \sum_{0\le p\le n} \eta_p\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)} - \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) - \sum_{1\le p\le n} \eta_{p-1}\left(\left[\ Q\left\{\frac{Q^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)} - \ \eta_n(f)\right\}\right]^2\right) \\
&= \sum_{0\le p\le n} \eta_p\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)} - \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right) - \sum_{0\le p< n} \eta_p(g)^2\ \eta_p\left(\left[\ \frac{Q^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)} - \frac{g}{\eta_p(g)}\ \eta_n(f)\right]^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The last assertion follows from

$$\eta_{p-1}\left(\left[\ Q\left\{\frac{Q^{n-p}(f)}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)} - \ \eta_n(f)\right\}\right]^2\right) = \eta_{p-1}\left(\left[\ \left\{\frac{\eta_{p-1}(g)\ Q^{n-(p-1)}(f)}{\eta_{p-1} Q^{n-(p-1)}(1)} - g\ \eta_n(f)\right\}\right]^2\right).$$

By theorem 14.4.3 in [10] we also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& w_n^{soft}(f) \\
& = \eta_0\left(\left[\frac{Q^n}{\eta_0 Q^n(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right) + \sum_{1\le p\le n}\mathbb{E}\left(\left(U_p\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}\,(f-\eta_n(f))\right]\ \right)^2\right) \\
& = \eta_0\left(\left[\frac{Q^n}{\eta_0 Q^n(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right) \\
& + \sum_{1\le p\le n}\left[\eta_p\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right) - \eta_{p-1}\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-(p-1)}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right)\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N\to\infty} w_n^{soft}(f) \\
& = \eta_0\left(\left[\frac{Q^n}{\eta_0 Q^n(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right) + \sum_{1\le p\le n}\left[\eta_p\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right)\right. \\
& \qquad\qquad \left. -(\eta_{p-1}(g)^2-1+1)\ \eta_{p-1}\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-(p-1)}}{\eta_{p-1}Q^{n-(p-1)}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right)\right] \\
& = \eta_n\left([f-\eta_n(f)]^2\right) + \sum_{0\le p<n}(1-\eta_p(g)^2)\ \eta_p\left(\left[\frac{Q^{n-p}}{\eta_p Q^{n-p}(1)}(f-\eta_n(f))\right]^2\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof of proposition 5.1

Recalling that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{1\le l\le d}\sin\left(\frac{il\pi}{d+1}\right) &= \frac{\cos\left(\frac{i\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)-\cos\left(\frac{(2d+1)i\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)}{2\sin\left(\frac{i\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)} \\
&= \frac{\cos\left(\frac{i\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)}{2\sin\left(\frac{i\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)}\ (1-(-1)^i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad i \text{ is even} \\ \cot\left(\frac{i\pi}{2(d+1)}\right) & \text{if} \quad i \text{ is odd} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q^n(1)(k) &= \frac{2}{d+1}\sum_{1\le i\ \text{odd}\le d} E_{i-1}^n\ \sin\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\ k\pi\right)\ \cot\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\ \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \\
&= \frac{4}{d+1}\sum_{1\le i\ \text{odd}\le d} E_{i-1}^n\ \cos^2\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\ \frac{\pi}{2}\right)\ U_{k-1}\left(\cos\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\ \pi\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with the Chebychev polynomial of the second kind

$$U_k(\cos\alpha) = \frac{\sin\left((k+1)\alpha\right)}{\sin\left(\alpha\right)} \in [-(k+1),(k+1)].$$

When $k=1$ we have

$$Q^n(1)(1) \;\; = \;\; \frac{4}{d+1} \sum_{1\leq i_{\rm odd}\leq d} E^n_{i-1} \;\cos^2\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\;\frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

This readily implies that

$$Q^{2n}(1)(k) \leq (k+1)\; Q^{2n}(1)(1) \Longrightarrow \rho(Q^{2n}(1)) \leq (d+1)$$

and for odd powers

$$\frac{Q^{2n+1}(1)(1)}{Q^{2n+1}(1)(k)} = \sum_x \frac{g(1)M(1,x)}{\sum_y g(k)M(k,y)\;\; Q^{2n}(1)(y)/Q^{2n}(1)(x)} \leq (d+1)\;\rho(g).$$

Working a little harder we observe that the extreme value of the function

$$1 \leq i \text{ odd} \leq d \mapsto U_{k-1}\left(\cos\left(\frac{i}{d+1}\;\pi\right)\right)$$

is attained at $i=1$ and it is given by

$$U_{k-1}\left(\cos\left(\frac{1}{d+1}\;\pi\right)\right) = \frac{\sin\left(\;k\;\frac{1}{d+1}\;\pi\right)}{\sin\left(\;\frac{1}{d+1}\;\pi\right)}.$$

This implies that

$$Q^{2n}(1)(k) \leq \frac{\sin\left(\;k\;\frac{1}{d+1}\;\pi\right)}{\sin\left(\;\frac{1}{d+1}\;\pi\right)}\; Q^{2n}(1)(1) \Longrightarrow\; \rho(Q^{2n}(1)) \leq \frac{1}{\sin\left(\;\frac{1}{d+1}\;\pi\right)}.$$

The end of the proof of the proposition is now easily completed. ∎

Proof of theorem 4.1

We set $A=(2+\theta)\;R$ and $B=(2+\theta)\;Q$. We have

$$\lambda_{max}(A) = (2+\theta)\;\widetilde{E}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{max}(B) = (2+\theta)\;E_0.$$

This shows that

$$\widetilde{E}_0/E_0^2 = \frac{\lambda_{max}(A)}{\lambda_{max}(B)^2}\;(2+\theta) = (2+\theta)\;\frac{\lambda_{max}(A)}{\left(\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{(d+1)}\right)\right)^2}.$$

This yields the equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{E}_0/E_0^2 \geq 1+\delta\left(\theta+2\cos\left(\tfrac{\pi}{(d+1)}\right)\right)^{-2} \\ &\Longleftrightarrow (2+\theta)\lambda_{max}(A) \geq \left(\theta+2\cos\left(\tfrac{\pi}{(d+1)}\right)\right)^2+\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

On the other hand, the largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix $A=(A(i,j))_{1\leq i,j\leq d}$ is given by

$$\lambda_{max}(A)=\max_{v\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} v'Av$$

where $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}=\{v\in\mathbb{R}^d\ :\ \sum_{1\leq i\leq d} v_i^2=1\}$ stands for the unit Euclidian sphere. Choosing

$$v(k)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\ \varphi_{0,\theta}(k)=\sqrt{\frac{2}{d+1}}\ \sin\left[\frac{k}{d+1}\ \pi\right]$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} v'Av &= v'Bv+2\left(2\sqrt{\epsilon_\theta}-1\right)\ v(1)v(2)-(1-\epsilon_\theta)\ \theta\ (v(1)^2+v(2)^2) \\ &= v'Bv+2\left(2\sqrt{\epsilon_\theta}-1-\theta\ (1-\epsilon_\theta)\right)\ v(1)v(2)-(1-\epsilon_\theta)\ \theta\ (v(1)-v(2))^2 \\ &= \left(\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)+\left(2\sqrt{\frac{1+\theta}{2+\theta}}-1\right)\ \frac{4}{d+1}\sin\left[\frac{1}{d+1}\ \pi\right]\sin\left[\frac{2}{d+1}\ \pi\right] \\ &\qquad -\frac{\theta}{2+\theta}\ \frac{2}{d+1}\ \left(\sin^2\left[\frac{1}{d+1}\ \pi\right]+\sin^2\left[\frac{2}{d+1}\ \pi\right]\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that

$$(1\geq)\ \left(2\sqrt{\frac{1+\theta}{2+\theta}}-1\right)=\frac{1}{2+\theta}\left(2\sqrt{(1+\theta)(2+\theta)}-(2+\theta)\right)\geq\frac{\theta}{2+\theta}$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (2+\theta)\ v'Av &= v'Bv+2\left(2\sqrt{\epsilon_\theta}-1\right)\ v(1)v(2)-(1-\epsilon_\theta)\ \theta\ (v(1)^2+v(2)^2) \\ &= \left(\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)^2+2(2+\theta)\left(2\sqrt{\epsilon_\theta}-1-\theta\ (1-\epsilon_\theta)\right)\ v(1)v(2) \\ &\qquad +4\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left(1-\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right) \\ &\qquad +\theta\ \left[2\left(1-\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)-(v(1)-v(2))^2\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sin\left[\frac{1}{d+1}\ \pi\right] - \sin\left[\frac{2}{d+1}\ \pi\right] &= -2\sin\left[\frac{1}{2(d+1)}\ \pi\right]\cos\left[\frac{3}{2(d+1)}\ \pi\right] \\
1-\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right) &= 2\sin^2\left[\frac{1}{2(d+1)}\ \pi\right] \\
\sin\left[\frac{1}{d+1}\ \pi\right]\sin\left[\frac{2}{d+1}\ \pi\right] &= 2\sin^2\left[\frac{1}{d+1}\ \pi\right]\cos\left[\frac{1}{d+1}\ \pi\right]
\end{aligned}$$

we check that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2+\theta)\ v'Av &= \left(\theta + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)^2 + 2(2+\theta)\left(2\sqrt{\epsilon_\theta} - 1 - \theta\ (1-\epsilon_\theta)\right)\ v(1)v(2) \\
&\quad +4\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left(1-\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right) \\
&\quad +4\theta\ \sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\ \left[\frac{d-1}{d+1} + \frac{2}{d+1}\sin^2\left[\frac{3}{2(d+1)}\ \pi\right]\right].
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that

$$(2+\theta)\lambda_{max}(A) \geq \left(\theta + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{(d+1)}\right)\right)^2 + \delta$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta &= 2^3\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{\frac{2}{d+1}\left(\sqrt{(1+\theta)(2+\theta)} - (1+\theta)\right)\ \sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right] + \sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\right\} \\
&\quad +2^2\theta\ \sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\ \left[\frac{d-1}{d+1} + \frac{2}{d+1}\sin^2\left[\frac{3}{2(d+1)}\ \pi\right]\right] \\
&\geq 2^3\sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\ \left[\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{1 + \frac{2}{d+1}\left(\sqrt{(1+\theta)(2+\theta)} - (1+\theta)\right)\right\}\right. \\
&\quad \left. +\theta\ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{d+1}\cos^2\left[\frac{3}{2(d+1)}\ \pi\right]\right)\right] \\
&\geq 4\sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right] \\
&\quad \times\ \left[\theta\ \left(1-\frac{2}{d+1}\right) + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{1 + \frac{2}{d+1}\ \frac{\sqrt{1+\theta}}{\sqrt{2+\theta}+\sqrt{1+\theta}}\right\}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{E}_0/E_0^2 &\geq 1 + 4\sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\ \left[\theta + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right]^{-2} \\
&\quad \times\ \left[\theta\ \left(1-\frac{2}{d+1}\right) + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{1 + \frac{2}{d+1}\ \frac{\sqrt{1+\theta}}{\sqrt{2+\theta}+\sqrt{1+\theta}}\right\}\right] \\
&= 1 + 4\sin^2\left[\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right]\ [\theta+2]^{-2}\ E_0^{-2} \\
&\quad \times\ \left[\theta\ \left(1-\frac{2}{d+1}\right) + 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{1 + \frac{2}{d+1}\ \frac{\sqrt{1+\theta}}{\sqrt{2+\theta}+\sqrt{1+\theta}}\right\}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{E}_0 &\geq E_0^2 + \frac{2}{(\theta+2)^2}\ \left(1-\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)\\ &\qquad \times\ \left[\theta\ \left(1-\frac{2}{d+1}\right)+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{1+\frac{2}{d+1}\ \frac{\sqrt{1+\theta}}{\sqrt{2+\theta}+\sqrt{1+\theta}}\right\}\right].\end{aligned}$$

We also have the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{max}(A) &\leq \lambda_{max}(B)+\max_{v\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}\left((2\sqrt{\epsilon_\theta}-1)\ \ 2v(1)v(2)-(1-\epsilon_\theta)\ \theta\ (v(1)^2+v(2)^2)\right)\\ &= \left(\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)\\ &\qquad +\frac{1}{2+\theta}\max_{v\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}\left(\left(2\sqrt{(1+\theta)(2+\theta)}-(2+\theta)\right)\ \ 2v(1)v(2)-\theta\ (v(1)^2+v(2)^2)\right)\\ &\leq \left(\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2+\theta}\left[\left(2\sqrt{(1+\theta)(2+\theta)}-(2+\theta)\right)-\theta\right].\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\widetilde{E}_0/E_0^2 \leq 1+2\ \frac{\sqrt{\theta+1}}{\sqrt{2+\theta}+\sqrt{\theta+1}}\left(\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)^{-2}+4\ \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)}{\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)}.$$

Equivalently, we have

$$\widetilde{E}_0 \leq E_0^2+\frac{2}{(\theta+2)^2}\ \left[\frac{\sqrt{\theta+1}}{\sqrt{2+\theta}+\sqrt{\theta+1}}\ +\left(\theta+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)\ \ \left(1-\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\right)\right].$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\widetilde{E}_0}{E_0^2} &\geq 1+\ \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)}{\theta/2+\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)}\ \frac{\left[\theta\ \frac{d-1}{d+1}+2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)\left\{1+\frac{2}{d+1}\ \frac{\sqrt{1+\theta}}{\sqrt{2+\theta}+\sqrt{1+\theta}}\right\}\right]}{\theta/2+\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)}\\ &\geq 1+\ \frac{2}{3}\ \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2(d+1)}\right)}{\theta/2+\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{d+1}\right)}\geq 1+\ \frac{1}{2+\theta}\ \frac{4}{3}\ \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{d+1}\ \frac{\pi}{2}\right)\end{aligned}$$

as soon as $d\geq 2$.

This ends the proof of the theorem. ■

Some Taylor inequalities

$$f(x)=f(y)+(x-y)\ f'(y)+\frac{(x-y)^2}{2}\ f''(x)+\frac{(x-y)^3}{3!}\ \int_0^1\ 3(1-t)^2\ f'''(x+t(y-x))\ dt.$$

For any $x \in]0, \pi/2[$

$$x - \frac{x^3}{3!} \;\leq\; \sin(x) \;\leq\; x - \frac{x^3}{3!}\,\cos(x)$$

$$x + \frac{x^3}{3} \;\leq\; \tan(x) \;\leq\; x + \frac{x^3}{3}\,\left[1 + \tan^2(x)\,\left(4 + 3\,\tan^2(x)\right)\right].$$

Recalling the formulae

$$1 + u \;\leq \frac{1}{1-u} = 1 + u\,\left(1 + \frac{u}{1-u}\right) \Leftrightarrow 1 - v \;\leq \frac{1}{1+v} = 1 - v\,\left(1 - \frac{v}{1+v}\right)$$

which are valid for any $u \neq 1$ and $v \neq -1$, we also have

$$\frac{1}{x} \;\leq\; \frac{1}{x}\,\left(1 + \frac{x^2}{3!}\,\cos(x)\right) \leq \frac{1}{\sin(x)} \leq \frac{1}{x}\,\left(1 + \frac{x^2}{3! - x^2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{x}\,\left(1 + \frac{x^2}{2}\right) \leq \frac{3}{x} \qquad (44)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{x}\,\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{3}\,\left[1 + \tan^2(x)\,\left(4 + 3\,\tan^2(x)\right)\right]\right) \leq \cot(x) \leq \frac{1}{x}\,\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{3 + x^2}\right) \;\leq\; \frac{1}{x}.$$

References

[1] A. Asselah, P. A. Ferrari, P. Groisman. Quasi-stationary distributions and Fleming-Viot processes in finite spaces. J. Appl. Probab. vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 322–332 (2011).

[2] G.I. Bell. Models of carcinogenesis as an escape from mitotic inhibitors. Science, vol. 192, pp. 569-572 (1976)

[3] W.A. Beyer, M.S. Waterman. A conditioned random walk with applications. Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory report LA-6990-MS (1977).

[4] W. Böhm, M.S. Gopal On Random Walks with Barriers and their Application to Queues. Forschungsberichte / Institut für Statistik, 21. Department of Statistics and Mathematics, WU Vienna University of Economics and Business, Vienna (1991).

[5] H.P. Chan, P. Del Moral, A. Jasra. A Sharp First Order Analysis of Feynman-Kac Particle Models Part II: Particle Gibbs Samplers (2016).

[6] F. Cerou, , P. Del Moral, & A. Guyader. A non-asymptotic theorem for unnormalized Feynman-Kac particle models. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaire, 47, 629–649 (2011).

[7] Y. Chen, P. Diaconis, S. Holmes & J. S. Liu. Sequential Monte Carlo methods for statistical analysis of tables. J. Amer. Statist. Ass., 100, 109–120, (2005).

[8] N. Chopin. Central limit theorem for sequential Monte Carlo methods and its application to Bayesian inference. Ann Statist., 32, 2385–2411 (2004).

[9] P. Del Moral. Feynman-Kac Formulae: Genealogical and Interacting Particle Systems with Applications. Springer: New York (2004)..

[10] P. Del Moral. Mean Field Simulation for Monte Carlo Integration. Chapman & Hall: London (2013).

[11] P. Del Moral, A. Doucet. Particle Motions in Absorbing Medium with Hard and Soft Obstacles. Stochastic Analysis and Applications, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1175–1207 (2004).

[12] P. Del Moral, A. Guionnet. On the stability of Measure Valued Processes with Applications to filtering. C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, t. 329, Serie I, pp. 429-434 (1999).

[13] P. Del Moral, A. Guionnet. On the stability of interacting processes with applications to filtering and genetic algorithms. Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincarï¿½, Vol. 37, No. 2, 155-194 (2001).

[14] P. Del Moral, J. Jacod. Interacting particle filtering with discrete-time observations: asymptotic behaviour in the Gaussian case. Stochastics in finite/infinite dimensions, pp. 101-123. Trends in Mathematics, Birkhauser, Eds. Hida T., Karandikar R., Kunita H., Rajput B., Watanabe S. and Xiong J. (2001).

[15] P. Del Moral, L. Miclo. Branching and Interacting Particle Systems Approximations of Feynman-Kac Formulae with Applications to Non-Linear Filtering. Séminaire de Probabilités XXXIV, Ed. J. Azéma and M. Emery and M. Ledoux and M. Yor. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag Berlin, Vol. 1729, 1-145 (2000).

[16] P. Del Moral, L. Miclo. On the Stability of Non Linear Semigroup of Feynman-Kac Type. Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse, vol.11,no.2, pp. (2002)

[17] P. Del Moral, D. Villemonais Exponential mixing properties for time inhomogeneous diffusion processes with killing arXiv:1412.2627, to appear in Bernoulli (2014).

[18] P. Diaconis and D. Stroock, Geometric bounds for eigenvalues for Markov chains, Ann. Appl. Probab. 1, pp. 36–61 (1991).

[19] P. Diaconis, L. Miclo. On quantitative convergence to quasi-stationarity. ArXiv:1406.1805 (2014).

[20] A. M. El-Shehawey; B. N. Al-Matrafi. On a gambler's ruin problem. Mathematica Slovaca, Vol. 47 , No. 4, 483–488 (1997).

[21] C. J. Everett, P.R. Stein. The combinatorics of random walk with absorbing barriers. Discrete Mathematics, Vol. 17, pp. 27-45 (1977).

[22] W. Feller, An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications, 3rd ed. Wiley, New York (1968).

[23] P. A. Ferrari, S. Martï¿½nez, P. Picco. Existence of Non-Trivial Quasi-Stationary Distributions in the Birth-Death Chain. Advances in Applied Probability, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 795–813 (1992).

[24] M. B. Giles. Multilevel Monte Carlo methods. Acta Numerica, 24, 259-328 (2015) .

[25] H. C. Gupta, A. Seth. Random walk in the presence of absorbing barriers. Proc. Nat. Inst. Sci. India. A, Vol 32, pp. 472-480 (1966).

[26] M. Kac. Random walk in the presence of absorbing barriers. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics. Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 62-67 (1945).

[27] G. Kreweras. Sur les éventails de segments. Cahiers du Bureau universitaire de recherche opérationnelle Série Recherche 15, pp. 3– 41 (1970).

[28] Nevena Maric. Fleming-Viot particle system driven by a random walk on $\mathbb{N}$. `Arxiv 1405.0094` (2014), Journal of Stat. Phys. 160: 548. doi:10.1007/s10955-015-1275-0 (2015).

[29] D. S. Novikov, E. Fieremans, J. H. Jensen, J. A. Helpern. Random walks with barriers. Nature Physics, vol. 7, pp. 508–514 doi:10.1038/nphys1936 (2011)

[30] E. Seneta. Quasi-stationary behaviour in the random walk with continuous time. Austral. J. Statist. vol. 8, pp. 92–98 (1966).

[31] F. Stern. Absorption sequences. Fibonacci Quarterly 17, pp. 275–280 (1979).

[32] A.M. Yaglom. Certain limit theorems of the theory of branching stochastic processes (in Russian). Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (n.s.) vol .56, pp. 795–798 (1947).

[33] J. Wang, J. & A. Jasra. Monte Carlo algorithms for computing $\alpha-$permanents. Statist. Comp., 26, 231–248 (2016).

[34] B. Weesakul. The random walk between a reflecting and an absorbing barrier. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics. Vol. 32, No. 768 (1961).

[35] N. Whiteley. Stability properties of some particle filters. Ann. Appl. Probab., 23, 2500-2537 (2013).

[36] N. Whiteley. & A. Lee. Twisted particle filters. Ann Statist., 42, 115-141 (2014).